The Superstition called Socialism

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES

THE GIFT OF
MAY TREAT MORRISON
IN MEMORY OF
ALEXANDER F MORRISON

*

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/superstitioncall00tunz

THE SUPERSTITION CALLED SOCIALISM

GEORGE ALLEN
& COMPANY
LIMITED
RUSKIN HOUSE
PUBLISHERS
LONDON

THE SUPERSTITION

CALLED

SOCIALISM

BY

G. W. DE TUNZELMANN, B.Sc.

MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTION OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS

AUTHOR OF "ELECTRICITY IN MODERN LIFE, CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE SERIES" "WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY," AND "A TREATISE ON ELECTRICAL THEORY AND THE PROBLEM OF THE UNIVERSE"

LONDON

GEORGE ALLEN & COMPANY, LTD.

44 & 45 RATHBONE PLACE

1911

[All rights reserved]

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co
At the Ballantyne Press, Edinburgh

HX
246
T83s

11-1-45

PREFACE

GIFT OF MRS. A. F. MORRISON MAR 27'43

This book has been written primarily to meet the requirements of the anti-Socialist speaker, but it will also appeal to every thinking advocate of Social Progress, for it contains a dispassionate reasoned presentation of Constructive Social Progress based upon Reason and Experience, and compares it with the Disruptive schemes of Collectivism on the one hand, and of Anarchism on the other.

The method employed throughout is that of reasoned argument from facts which the references given will enable every reader to verify for himself. The book therefore appeals just as much to the thinking Socialist as to the thinking anti-Socialist. The only Socialist to whom it will not appeal is he who blindly accepts the statements of his leaders, and is not possessed of sufficient intelligence to understand, or even to attempt to understand, the arguments on either side.

Many of the Socialists whom I have met

483092

in controversy will, I feel sure, be glad to have the opportunity of studying, in a connected form, arguments, some of which they have already had presented to them in addresses and debates. Moreover, they contain, with the addition of much new matter, the substance of a series of lectures delivered in 1910 to selected students attending schools of instruction of the Anti-Socialist Union, who were desirous and capable of considering the subject from the fundamental point of view. Some of my Socialist opponents, who were very desirous of hearing these lectures, but were excluded by the then existing regulations of the Union, will now have the opportunity of making themselves fully acquainted with the arguments against their position. Some of them, I trust, will be convinced of their errors, and so enabled to join the constructive forces which are fighting the battle of Social Progress.

To the leaders both of Collectivism and of Anarchism it is a challenge. If they do not attempt to refute the arguments here presented it will be because they are aware that the attempt would be hopeless. For these arguments will not reach only the readers of this volume. They will be presented to indoor and

outdoor audiences by anti-Socialist speakers throughout the country.

It has only been on very rare occasions that I have met with personal discourtesy from Socialists whom I have met in controversy, or whom I have had the pleasure of addressing. Occasionally an opponent who found himself unable either to answer or to evade an argument has resorted to the clumsy device of admitting his defeat by becoming abusive, but far more frequently the admission has been candidly and honestly made that he had been driven from his position. The most flagrant instance of the retort abusive which I have experienced is the one made by *The Clarion* to a challenge sent to Mr. Blatchford nine months earlier. It is reprinted and dealt with on pp. 126 *et seqq.* Amusing evasions are more common. Mr. Wallhead, in a recent issue of the *Labour Leader*, refers with affected nonchalance to the well-known "vapouring of the Anti-Socialist Union." Probably the instance which Mr. Wallhead treasures up for reference was the first, quite unofficial, attempt of a beginner, after his first lesson as a student, attempting to try his strength before he was prepared for it. Perhaps Mr. Wallhead has a convenient memory which

enables him to forget the many occasions on which he has heard sound arguments to which he could make no manner of reply. I may take another example from the *Leicester Pioneer*, the journal supported by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's constituents, in reference to an article of mine entitled *Sociality not Socialism*, which was sent by the Anti-Socialist Union to a number of provincial papers. The writer devoted a whole paragraph to a war dance on what he was pleased to describe as my "high sounding foreign name." He evidently had so little idea of the meaning of reason as to believe that it would be discredited if it came from a foreigner. This was foolish, and it was equally foolish to make a suggestion, which happened to be incorrect, without making inquiry. Reasoned argument must be met by reason, and where it comes from is a matter of indifference to any one of even the most modest intelligence. Moreover, I have the right of every British subject to take part in the politics of his country. This gentleman would probably have abstained from challenging it in so clumsy a manner if he had been aware that I have had forbears fighting British battles for some few centuries. In his next paragraph an attempt was made to

represent me as a Socialist, and it concluded with an approving quotation of the gist and conclusion of the article, accompanied by a considerable ebullition of temper at the impossibility of finding anything to which he could object.

Socialists with definite aims are divided into two groups: the State Socialists, who believe that the people ought to be governed more; and the Communal Anarchists, who believe that they ought to be governed less.

State Socialism is shown, from first principles as well as from the admissions of its leaders, to be essentially destructive to personal liberty and to all the higher faculties which distinguish man from brute. Communal Anarchism requires only to be stated clearly for its absurdity to become evident: its origin is traced to the perversion of a true and sublime ideal.

The book is divided into two parts, the first dealing with economics and other practical considerations, while the second and smaller part deals briefly with the general principles which afford a guide in the discrimination between methods leading to social growth and those leading to social decay, and concludes with their application to the existing Political Crisis.

Preface

The Socialist journals, in common with the mere street corner orators, are never tired of representing every anti-Socialist, and more especially the Anti-Socialist Union, as being opposed to Social Reform in every shape. The strenuous advocacy of Social Reform by Mr. Walter Long, M.P., the Vice-President of the Union, has therefore greatly roused their ire, and the *Labour Leader* of March 24, 1911, endeavours to minimise its effect upon the minds of thinking workmen in an article headed "Walter Long—Socialist?" in which an attempt is made to represent his views as being the result of Socialist propaganda. This is a somewhat transparent device, but it is important to call attention to such misrepresentations for the simple reason that there is just sufficient truth underlying them to make them dangerous if left unexposed. This element of truth is found in the fact that a certain portion of the Socialist propaganda has always concerned itself with the searching out and exposure of abuses. In doing this the Socialists have rendered, and are rendering, good service to the cause of Social Progress. Unfortunately, these abuses are largely employed by the Socialists to sow the seeds of class hatred, for which purpose the facts are usually grossly

exaggerated and often garnished with mere malevolent fictions. Moreover, the remedies they propose would, more often than not, aggravate the ills which they are intended to cure. These points are well expressed in the following paragraphs from the penny pamphlet, *Exposure of the Socialist Conspiracy*, which has just been issued by the Anti-Socialist Union :—

"To-day in the United Kingdom the crying need—a need recognised by all parties—is Social Reform.

"To whom shall the work of remedying the admitted evils and reducing the glaring inequalities of Society be entrusted? The Socialists have done good service in calling our attention to those evils and inequalities, but, just as it does not follow that the first person who perceives the spots on a patient suffering from small-pox is the proper person to be his medical attendant, it does not necessarily follow that the Socialists should be the State's advisers on such matters as poverty, unemployment, and ignorance.

"The Anti-Socialist Union warns the public that if it expects miraculous cures from the Socialists, it will find that it is grievously mistaken.

"If Society is to be cured of its diseases, it

must call in specialists, and not fly to advertising vendors of patent medicines!"

The present volume is the expression of my own personal views throughout, but the sixth chapter, in which the essentials of Social Reform are dealt with, has been read in proof by several of the leading members of the Union. They have all approved it, and not one of them has advocated the alteration of a single sentence. It may, therefore, although quite unofficial, be accepted as substantially representing the standpoint of the Anti-Socialist Union in its campaign for Social Reform, through the growth and development of our great and ancient Constitution, in opposition to all attempts to destroy this Constitution, and to replace it by one or other of the discordant and mutually destructive Socialist panaceas.

The attempt, in Chapter XII., to classify the warring battalions engaged in the existing political conflict, under the heads of constructive and destructive forces, respectively, necessarily covers a wider field than that embraced by the policy of the Anti-Socialist Union, which concerns itself only with the battle of *Social Reform* v. *Socialism and its Allies.* Members of the Union may be Tariff Reformers or Free Traders, Home Rulers or Anti-Home Rulers,

and these may, and do, stand side by side on the platform of the Anti-Socialist Union, as expressed in the words italicised. The platform is wide enough, and it may be expressed in still wider and more abstract terms, and in this I know that the view of the responsible leaders is the same as my own. The battle in which Socialism shall give way to true Social Reform is the battle in which Materialism shall be utterly destroyed in the light of the rising Sun of Idealism.

Materialism and its concomitant, Atheism, no longer exist as systems of thought, but only as the superstitions of unreasoning ignorance. But a long and a strenuous battle has to be fought against the fruits of Materialism in every stratum of Society, and in this battle God and the Right is the motto inscribed upon the banners of our army.

The complete destruction of Materialism and all its fruits would not merely mean the presentation of higher ideals to the poor, amongst whom the existence of low and material ideals is most excusable and most to be expected, although they are the greatest sufferers by the restriction of an outlook which is in their case so terribly narrow and sordid. It would mean the creation of higher ideals than the mere pursuit

of wealth and pleasure in all grades of Society. It would involve the stern reprobation of the "sweater" of his workpeople, even if he attempted, as too many now do, to cover his vileness with a thin veneer of philanthropy by the expenditure of a small percentage of his ill-gotten gains. No place of honour and respect would any longer be accorded to the *unco guid* who build chapels with the secret profits of gambling hells. Cocoa millionaires who, amongst their neighbours and on the platform, denounce the most innocent bet as an offence against God and man, would perhaps no longer find it conducive to their comfort to support with one hand a daily journal from which all betting news is excluded, and with the other, another daily which works havoc in the homes of too impressionable working men by its extravagant prognostications of the results to be expected from plunging on its racing tips.

I would ask every reader of this volume who desires to aid in this great work, either by personal service or financial support, to take the trouble to send a letter to the Secretary of the Anti-Socialist Union, of 58 and 60 Victoria Street, Westminster, for information as to the work already accomplished by the Union, and

the manner in which his or her services may best be utilised.

In conclusion I have to express my thanks for permission to make extracts from the works mentioned below:—To the Committee of the Catholic Truth Society, in the case of Pope Leo XIII.'s encyclical on *The Condition of the Working Classes;* to Mr. J. A. Hobson and Messrs. Longmans & Co., in the case of *The Industrial System,* a book which every serious student should study from end to end; to Messrs. Fisher Unwin, in the case of Prof. Thorold Rogers' most valuable work on *The Economic Interpretation of History;* and to the editors of *Blackwood's Magazine* and the *Fortnightly Review,* in the case of *Musings without Method,* and the article by "G." on *Anarchist Propaganda in England.* Finally, I have to express my indebtedness to my own publishers for their courtesy and attention during the passage of this work through the press.

G. W. DE TUNZELMANN.

March 23, 1911.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION xxiii

PART I

THE ECONOMICS AND PRACTICE OF SOCIALISM CONTRASTED WITH THOSE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

CHAPTER I

MARX'S THEORY OF EXCHANGE-VALUE

Commodities — Use-values — Exchange-values, Marxian and actual—Mechanical work—Directivity, Simple and General—Marx on "The Fetishism of Commodities" 3

CHAPTER II

MARX'S THEORY OF CAPITAL

Circulation of commodities—Ghosts of commodities—Marxian and actual circulation—Marx's self-contradictions—Lassalle's *Iron Law of Wages*—Subsistence wages and sweating wages—The Labour process—Marxian surplus-value—Constant and variable capital—Capitalists classified—Superstitious Socialism . 21

Contents

CHAPTER III

LAND, CAPITAL, LABOUR, AND PROFIT

PAGE

J. A. Hobson's analysis—Subsistence wages—Moral stimulus requisite—Effect of industrial growth on wages—Depreciation and improvement funds—Interest and compensation for risk—Stimulus to evoke capital—Land as capital—Necessary costs of production—Surplus product—Land nationalisation—Scarcity rates—Profit—Business ability—Functions of the undertaker 50

CHAPTER IV

THE MARXIAN DOCTRINE OF A CLASS WAR

Fallacious origin of the doctrine—The Communist manifesto—Falsity of Marx's predictions—Ramsay MacDonald's destructive criticism of the doctrine—His misconception of Socialism and his progress towards reason—Socialism and Sociality—Ferri's views—MacDonald compared with Marx and Ferri . . 69

CHAPTER V

SOCIALIST GROUPS AND AIMS

The defining formula of Socialism—Diversity of Socialist schemes—Jules Guesde and Gabriel Deville on the abolition of the family—Classification of Socialists—State Socialists—State Socialism a system of slavery: views of Bax, Webb, Butler, Hyndman, Wells, and Blatchford—Webb on the emptiness of the State Socialist programme—Anarchism and Anarchists—Communal Anarchism—Co-operation of Socialists and Anarchists—Anarchist schools—William Morris and

Contents

PAGE

The Clarion Anarchism—Its absurdity—Mentality of the Communal Anarchist leaders—Blatchford's fallacies—His avoidance of argument—His retort courteous—His self-laudation—Thompson, Grayson, Suthers, and Lowerison—Nebulous Socialism—Christian Socialism—The Rev. James Adderley's challenge accepted—Socialists and religion—A mental and moral degenerate honoured by the I.L.P.—Blatchford's inconsistencies—The Osborne judgment—Socialism and anti-patriotism—Keir Hardie's antics 84

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL PROGRESS BY THE WAY OF REASON AND EXPERIENCE

Aristotle on Communism—The three methods of Social Progress—Inconsistency of Socialism and Sociality—Basis for the brotherhood of man—Narrowness of Materialism—Christianity and Civilisation according to Renan, Mill, Mohammedan and Indian teaching, Lecky, and Gladstone—Voluntary organisation and legislation—Social parasitism and its remedy—Sweating and its elimination—Diffusion of ownership of land—The encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. *on the Conditions of the Working Classes*—Organisation in early English life—Artificers' Guilds—Success of small holdings in the past—Hyndman on the benefit of the early church to the poor—Robbery of the guild lands by Henry VIII., and of the benefit societies' funds—Oppression of the artisans and labourers under Elizabeth—Seventeenth century improvement in agriculture—Nineteenth century encroachments on common land—Fluctuation in employment—Remedies proposed by Cyril Jackson—Evil results of the Socialist domination of the trade unions—Labour representation in Parliament—True basis for the Labour movement—

Contents

PAGE

An injustice in Lloyd George's Budget, due to ignorance of the conditions of production—Error of the *single taxer*—Just taxation—Municipal trading . . 167

PART II

THE PSEUDO-PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF SOCIALISM AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL FEATURES OF THE MARXIAN THEORY OF SOCIALISM

The Materialistic basis—The economic structure—Ramsay MacDonald on the irrationality of Marx's inversion of Hegel's philosophy—Ferri's summary of Marx's standpoint—Its atheistic nature recognised by Marx—Marx's real achievement—Successive influence of Hegel, Feuerbach, and French Materialism on Marx and Engels—Philosophical origin of Marx's self-contradictions—His honesty of purpose vindicated by Hammacher—Marx's ignoring of Directivity a consequence of his Materialistic theory—Proudhon—The early English Socialists—Origin and construction of Marx' system 245

CHAPTER VIII

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF MATERIALISTIC DETERMINISM

Hypotheses of Materialism and of Necessity—An uncontrolled universe cannot be eternal—Nature of the controlling power derivable from observation—Origin of life—Consciousness—Materialism means Fatalism—Natural selection incapable of accounting for reason 259

Contents

CHAPTER IX

THE RATIONAL VIEW OF THE WORLD

PAGE

Vedic views—Basis of Matter—Mind defined—Mind capable of directing energy changes—Mind the giver of life—Universal Mind—Eternal Self-consciousness—Nature of human mind—Function of pain—Evil a necessity of free-will 276

CHAPTER X

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE

Formation of communities—Individualism and Altruism—Personality—Sociality and Socialism—Justice as Harmony—Rules and Laws—Ideal of Government—Negative and Positive Justice—The State and its sphere of action—Socialist State conception and its consequences—Ideals and the impulse of evolution . 287

CHAPTER XI

REASON AND SUPERSTITION

Evolution must be ethical—Scientific argument for immortality—Science and Superstition—Haeckel's passage from Science to Superstition—Absurdity of Haeckel's physics—The Riddle of the Universe, a return to crude polytheism—The "Rationalist" Little Bethel, and its aversion to Reason 301

CHAPTER XII

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN GROWTH AND DECAY

Conception of the State as an organism—The Socialist State and the Beehive—Socialism in ancient Peru—

Contents

PAGE

Successful Communism of religious communities—Its complete explanation—Sublime ideal of which Socialism and Anarchism are perversions—Common goal of science, philosophy, and religion—The French Revolution and the present political crisis—Radical-Socialist conspiracy against British liberty—The High Court of Parliament and its origin—The Constitution and its growth—Its attempted destruction by the forces of disruption and decay—Their various discordant reasons for assailing it—The coalition log-rollers—Political Parties and Labour legislation—The House of Lords and Labour legislation—Analysis of the defending and attacking forces, and their classification as forces of growth and decay . . . 328

INDEX 387

INTRODUCTION

THERE are two lines of attack on Socialistic systems, and the anti-Socialist who desires to qualify himself for controversy with Socialists of all grades of intelligence, and for enlightening their dupes of correspondingly varying intelligence, must be fully prepared to follow up either one of them according to the circumstances in each special case. They may be designated the Fundamental Method and the Superficial Method, respectively. The former consists in exposing the fundamental fallacies which, together or separately, form the foundation of every Socialist system. It is therefore a direct frontal attack upon the central citadel. The latter consists in exposing in detail the separate fallacies contained in the several superstructures erected by the various groups of Socialists. The first method is necessarily the more effective one where it is practicable, and it is practicable only in dealing with Socialists of sufficient knowledge and intelligence to be aware of the nature of the

foundations on which their various systems are based, or with dupes, or possible dupes, capable of following the arguments necessary to demonstrate the relation of the superstructure to the foundations, and those which demonstrate the irrationality of the foundations themselves.

The great mass of Socialists, and of sympathisers with Socialism, are only acquainted with some few of the details of the superstructure, and are totally incapable of grasping their connection with the foundations, and equally incapable of following the arguments by which these foundations are demolished. The anti-Socialist will therefore be compelled, in most cases, to have recourse to the second line of attack, with which I do not propose to deal in this volume.

The anti-Socialist speaker will, however, make a great mistake if he consider it unnecessary to make himself acquainted with the fundamental principles involved in the first method. Unless he fully grasp these principles he can never feel that his feet are planted upon a firm foundation. However extensive his study of details, he cannot expect to provide himself with a ready made answer to every question that may be raised, and to avoid

discomfiture when he has no such ready made answer, he must be prepared to fall back upon his foundations, in order to frame a satisfactory one.

Socialism has no scientific basis, but Socialists, although the majority of their leaders dissent from one or other portion of the Marxian system, are practically unanimous in regarding Marx as having focussed the various floating Socialistic theories current in his day into a system which they agree in designating "Scientific Socialism."

Enrico Ferri writes:[1] "Marxian Socialism —the only kind that has a positive method and scientific worth."

Ramsay MacDonald writes:[2] "In one aspect the only fault one has to find with Marxian formulae is but verbal. But words suggest ideas, and though the Marxian phrases based upon revolutionary conceptions are being more and more used with a modified meaning, their use does not lead to clear thinking."

Jaurès,[3] the ablest of the French Socialist

[1] *Socialism and Positive Science*, edited by J. Ramsay MacDonald, and published by the Independent Labour Party, p. 11.

[2] *Socialism and Society*, published by the Independent Labour Party, p. 115.

[3] *Studies in Socialism*, edited by J. Ramsay MacDonald and published by the Independent Labour Party, p. 43.

leaders, writes: "To Marx belongs the merit, perhaps the only one of all attributed to him that has fully withstood the trying tests of criticism and of time, of having drawn together and unified the Labour movement and the Socialist idea."

We may therefore consider the Marxian system as the central citadel of modern Socialism, and the two opening chapters are therefore devoted to the demolition of his economic structure, and this is effected independently of any considerations as to the solidity of the foundations upon which it was erected. The demolition of the foundations has been relegated to the second part, for the reason that the considerations involved are necessarily of a far more fundamental character, and it appeared preferable for the average reader to defer the investigation of them until he had first become familiar with the simpler and more concrete. The philosophical student may, if he so desire, begin with Part II., the demolition of the Marxian foundations, and then pass on to the demolition of the structure erected upon them, which is accomplished in Part I.

PART I

THE ECONOMICS AND PRACTICE OF SOCIALISM CONTRASTED WITH THOSE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

CHAPTER I[1]

MARX'S THEORY OF EXCHANGE-VALUE

MARX states quite correctly (p. 2) that "the utility of a thing makes it a use-value," and also that use-values "constitute the substance of all wealth."

Every object which has general use-value he calls "a commodity." He then proceeds to consider the meaning of *exchange-value*, and forthwith falls into his first fallacy. It is quite obvious that the exchange-value of a commodity is neither proportional to, nor directly determined by, its use-value or utility. For example, there is no commodity of greater utility to every human being than air, since it is essential to the continuance of his life. No one would, however, be willing, under normal circumstances, to give any other commodity in exchange for the air he breathes, for the simple reason that its

[1] The page references in the text refer to the fourth English edition of Marx's *Capital*.

universal diffusion enables him to obtain as much as he requires directly, without the assistance of any one. A diver below the surface of the water cannot, however, obtain the requisite supply of air in this direct manner. It may either be pumped down to him by others, or he may take down with him a supply of air in a containing vessel into which it has previously been pumped by himself or others. In this case, then, air acquires an exchange-value. Marx then points out, in the words of Barbon (p. 4), that "one sort of wares are as good as another, if the values [viz. the exchange-values] be equal. There is no difference or distinction in things of equal value. . . . A hundred pounds worth of lead or iron is of as great [exchange] value as one hundred pounds worth of silver or gold." He then continues in his own words: "As use-values, commodities are, above all, of different qualities, but as exchange-values they are merely different quantities, *and consequently do not contain an atom of use-value.* The fallacy is introduced by the sentence in italics. Marx's previously quoted statement that use-values "constitute the substance of all wealth," shows that the statement made above that "commodities . . . as exchange-values . . . do not contain an

atom of use-value" is equivalent to the statement that *commodities as exchange-values do not contain an atom of substance*, and are therefore mere phantoms of the imagination. The fallacy lies in the tacit assumption that because the substance of any commodity may be replaced by the equivalent amount of the substance of another commodity, without altering the exchange-value, the substance may therefore be removed entirely without affecting the exchange-value, an obvious absurdity. The device is simply that of the thimble-rigger who, while pretending to shift the pea from the shelter of one thimble to that of another, deftly removes it altogether, and the Marxian Socialist is as easily deluded as the bucolic victim of the thimble-rigger.

An exactly similar argument would lead to the conclusion that because a pound of feathers has the same weight as a pound of lead, therefore either could be extracted without altering the weight, leaving a pound of nothing as the equivalent weight. Marx continues (p. 4): "If then we leave out of consideration the use-value of commodities, they have only one common property left, that of being products of labour. But even the product of labour itself has undergone a change in our hands.

If we make abstraction from its use-value, we make abstraction at the same time from the material elements and shapes that make the product a use-value. . . . Along with the useful qualities of the products themselves, we put out of sight both the useful character of the various kinds of labour embodied in them, and the concrete forms of that labour. . . . Let us now consider the residue of each of these products : it consists of the same unsubstantial reality in each, a mere congelation of homogeneous human labour, of labour-power expended without regard to the mode of its expenditure. . . . When looked at as crystals of this social substance, common to them all, they are—*Values*. We have seen that when commodities are exchanged, their exchange-value manifests itself as something totally independent of their use-value. . . . Therefore the common substance that manifests itself in the exchange-value of commodities, whenever they are exchanged, is their *value*. The progress of our investigation will show that exchange-value is the only form in which the *value* of commodities can manifest itself or be expressed."

We see, then, that the Marxian term *value*, which I have italicised in the above quotations,

means exchange-value, as he tells us quite definitely that *value* can only be expressed in the form of exchange-value. What, then, is the Marxian exchange-value of an article? Clearly not what is usually meant by that word—the price which it will fetch—for the latter is, under given circumstances, something definite and concrete, while Marx tells us that what he means by the term is a crystal of social substance, a congelation of homogeneous human labour, an unsubstantial reality. He does not attempt to define the meaning of homogeneous human labour, an expression which does not appear to be capable of any definite meaning. It would be interesting, moreover, to know whether Marx himself ever attached any definite meaning to what he describes as an *unsubstantial reality*, which most people would regard as a contradiction in terms. This interpretation is certainly justified by Marx's statement that this *unsubstantial reality* is a *social substance*, from which it follows that either of these expressions represents *an unsubstantial substance*, which is an absolute self-contradiction. We are therefore driven to the conclusion that the Marxian exchange-value is a contradiction in terms, and therefore

incapable of meaning. The whole structure of Marxian economics, based as it is on his doctrine of exchange-value, is therefore founded upon a self-contradiction.

Marx, naturally, ignores this, and continues his argument on the false assumption that his *value* is something concrete, and states (p. 5): "A use-value, or useful article, therefore, has value only because human labour in the abstract has been embodied or materialised in it. How, then, is the magnitude of this value to be measured? Plainly by the quantity of the value-creating substance, the labour, contained in the article. The quantity of labour, however, is measured by its duration, and labour-time in its turn finds its standard in weeks, days, and hours." On p. 8 he tells us that "nothing can have value without being an object of utility. If the thing is useless, so is the labour contained in it, the labour does not count as labour, and therefore creates no value." Comparing this with the previously quoted statements that "exchange-value manifests itself as something totally independent of their use-value," and that "commodities—as exchange-values—do not contain an atom of use-value," we see that for a commodity to possess Marxian exchange-value, it must

possess a use-value, but that the amount of the use-value has no effect on the Marxian exchange-value.

A precisely similar pseudo-argument would lead to the conclusion that exchange-values do not contain an atom of labour-value. It might be formulated as follows: A hundred pounds worth of steel springs is of as great exchange-value as a hundred pounds worth of wooden tables. One contains steel-workers' labour-value, and the other wood-workers' labour-value. But exchange-values are merely different quantities, and consequently do not contain an atom of labour-value. If, then, we leave out of consideration the labour-values, they have only one common property left, that of being forms of matter. Now, along with the different kinds of labour-value embodied in the two commodities, we put out of sight the concrete forms of the matter of which they are composed. The residue then consists, in each case, of homogeneous matter, without regard to its nature. When looked at as containing this substance, common to them both, they are exchange-values. To use Marx's expression, this common substance is the *unsubstantial reality* common to steel and wood, and to all other forms of material

constituting the basis of commodities. The magnitudes of the exchange-values of different commodities must therefore be measured by the quantities which they contain of the value-creating substance which is common to all forms of material—steel, wood, stone, feathers, milk, wine, &c. It is obvious that the two so-called arguments are equally absurd, and contain exactly similar fallacies. Homogeneous matter, in this sense, and homogeneous human labour, are expressions equally void of meaning.

For the benefit of the great multitude of those who are unable to detect even such obvious fallacies as those contained in the two preceding so-called arguments, and by whom any kind of verbiage will be accepted as argument, if only it is called by the name, we must have recourse to simple examples of the absurd consequences which would follow from the assumption that the actual exchange-value of an article depends only on the amount of human labour expended in obtaining it.

Suppose that a man laboriously washes a pound of gold, by many days' labour, out of auriferous sand, and then finds a nugget weighing a pound in his next pailful. The Marxian exchange-value of the first pound would be many times greater than that of

the second. The gold merchant will, however, pay the same price for each pound. Again, suppose that man finds a large diamond and a large rock crystal, and spends the same amount of labour in cutting and polishing each of them. The Marxian exchange-values will then be equal. Yet the diamond will be of great value and the rock crystal almost valueless. These examples, and the reader will have no difficulty in multiplying them to any desired extent, prove, beyond the possibility of dispute by any rational being, that the Marxian concept of exchange-value has no relation to the practical concept of exchange-value employed in economic science, but is, as we have seen that he himself admits, something utterly unsubstantial and elusive.

The economic term exchange-value can have but one meaning, the value in money, or whatever may be the common medium of exchange, which can be obtained for a commodity in the open market. This will depend, in the first place, on its inherent utility or desirability, and, in the second place, on the relation between the supply and the demand for the commodity in question. If the supply be in excess of the demand, the exchange-value will be reduced by competition between the sellers, unless the

whole of these succeed in combining to form a ring or trust. Under the conditions of modern industry, with world-wide intercommunication, this can never be permanently and completely carried out, unless assisted by legislation, and if such legislation tend to the aggrandisement of a section of the community at the expense of the whole, it becomes essentially vicious in principle, and must be resisted. If, on the other hand, the demand be in excess of the supply, the exchange-value will be maintained by competition between buyers at a higher rate than it would otherwise have. No definite higher limit can be set to exchange-values of unique or even rare objects of desire, as we see exemplified in the case of unique objects of art or objects of special historical interest, as also in the case of jewels of exceptional size or rarity. A lower limit will, however, be fixed by the consideration that a commodity will cease to be produced if the exchange-value fall to such an extent that the producer finds it to his advantage to abandon its production and devote himself to other work. Subject to this lower limit, the economic exchange-value is, and can be, determined only by the relation of supply to demand.

While the economic, that is to say the actual,

exchange-value of a commodity can be determined only by the law of supply and demand, and cannot be estimated from its elements, it is of importance to consider the nature of these elements, as such consideration will often indicate means of reducing the cost of production.

The elements of exchange-value, and of wealth generally, are easily seen to be three in number:—(1) Natural Material; (2) Mechanical Work; (3) Directivity. Mechanical Work is simply the expenditure of energy, and is useless except under the influence of Directivity. Directivity is purely mental labour, but as it always acts, under the conditions of our existence, through the brain, it is necessarily accompanied by mechanical work in the brain tissues, which demand for their continuous renovation a periodical supply of energy in the form of food. Directivity may be conveniently divided into *Simple Directivity*, which directs the work of one pair of hands, the worker's own; and *General Directivity*, which directs the work of more than one pair of hands.

Simple Directivity may vary from that required for the execution of the simplest kind of unskilled manual labour to that requisite for the construction of the plans of the most

complex machine, or for the production of the noblest painting or sculpture. *General Directivity* may vary from that of a manual labourer, with a couple of boys working under his direction, to that of a statesman who directs the affairs of a great country.

All useful human labour must necessarily embody the two perfectly distinct elements, Mechanical Work, expressible in terms of energy; and Directivity, expressible only in terms of mind. It is true that, from a metaphysical standpoint, as explained in Chapter IX., energy may be regarded as included in and proceeding from mind; but beyond this we have no knowledge of the nature of their mutual relation, and no means of expressing one in terms of the other. It is therefore perfectly clear that no more definite meaning can be attached to such terms as homogeneous human labour, or average labour, than to such terms as homogeneous or average substance supposed to underlie all the different forms of matter. The two cases are in every way comparable, for just as mind is the underlying entity of energy, so the homogeneous formless ether is the underlying entity of all forms of matter, but this does not supply any practical means of representing different

substances, such as iron, wood, and stone, in terms of a common denominator.

Marx expressly recognises (p. 8) this "twofold nature of labour," and writes (p. 7): "In general, the greater the productiveness of labour, the less is the labour-time required for the production of an article, the less is the amount of labour crystallised in that article, and the less is its value; and *vice versâ*, the less the productiveness of labour, the greater is the labour-time required for the production of an article, and the greater is its value. The value of a commodity, therefore, varies directly as the quantity, and inversely as the productiveness, of the labour incorporated in it." This method of expressing the twofold nature of labour is very indefinite and confusing, in comparison with its expression in terms of mechanical work and directivity, and therefore serves to mask the fallacy of assuming the possibility of reducing various kinds of labour to one common denominator. Thus Marx asserts (p. 11): "The value of a commodity represents human labour in the abstract, the expenditure of human labour in general. . . . It is the expenditure of simple labour-power, *i.e.* of the labour-power which, on an average, apart from any special development, exists in the organism

of every ordinary individual. Simple average labour, it is true, varies in character in different countries and at different times, but in a particular society it is given. Skilled labour counts only as simple labour intensified, or rather, as multiplied simple labour, *a given quantity of skilled being considered equal to a greater quantity of unskilled labour.* Experience shows that this reduction is constantly being made."

The impossibility of making any such reduction, and the consequent absurdity of the proposition in italics, has already been demonstrated. If such a reduction were possible, then any or every skilled workman in a factory might be replaced by two or more navvies; or the designer of the Forth Bridge, the Assouan Dam, or a Dreadnought, might be replaced by a certain number of thousands of navvies. On p. 12 Marx informs us that "the different proportions in which different sorts of labour are reduced to unskilled labour as their standard, are established by *a social process that goes on behind the backs of the producers*, and consequently appear to be fixed by custom." The words in italics are indeed apposite for the description of so transparent a conjuring trick. It hardly seems possible for any reader of average intelligence to avoid the suspicion

that Marx is covertly laughing at him, and this suspicion seems almost turned into certainty by the sublime impudence of the next sentence. "For simplicity's sake, we shall henceforth account every kind of labour to be unskilled, simple labour; by this we do no more than save ourselves the trouble of making the reduction." The simplicity which Marx assumes on the part of the reader would appear to be nearly akin to that of "Simple Simon" in the nursery rhyme, for on p. 17, either he has forgotten, or he assumes that the reader has forgotten, these absurd reductions between incommensurable quantities, and remarks quite truly, but after the above quoted statements, either with daring cynicism or a fatuous blindness induced by the obsession of his predetermined conclusion, that "it is apt to be forgotten that the magnitudes of different things can be compared quantitatively, only when those magnitudes are expressed in terms of the same unit. It is only as expressions of such a unit that they are of the same denomination, and therefore commensurable." A remarkable section (p. 41) on "The Fetishism of Commodities and the Secret thereof" appears to afford strong indications that these absurd self-contradictions are due rather to such blindness

than to mere cynical contempt for the intelligence of his readers. It will be sufficient to quote a few of the more noteworthy passages, but the whole section is well worth careful reading, for the insight which it gives into the mental fog in which an otherwise acute mind has become enveloped through the obsession of Marx's fixed idea, the utterly false contention that robbery of the worker is the one and only source of all profit and all capital. Beginning with the opening sentence, Marx asserts that :—

"A commodity appears at first sight a very trivial thing, and easily understood. Its analysis shows that it is, in reality, *a very queer thing, abounding in metaphysical subtleties and theological niceties*. . . . A commodity is therefore *a mysterious thing*, simply because in it the social character of men's labour appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour ; because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour. . . . There is a physical relation between physical things. But it is different with commodities. There the existence of the things *qua* commodities, and the value relation between the products of labour

which stamps them as commodities, have absolutely no connection with their physical properties and with the material relations arising therefrom. There it is a definite social relation between men, that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things. In order, therefore, to find an analogy, *we must have recourse to the mist-enveloped regions* of the religious world. In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relation both with one another and the human race. So it is with the world of commodities, with the product of men's hands. This I call the Fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labour, so soon as they are produced as commodities, and which is therefore inseparable from the production of commodities. . . . It is value, rather, that converts every product into *a social hieroglyphic*. Later on we *try to decipher* the hieroglyphic, *to get behind the secret* of our own social products; for to stamp an object of utility as a value, is just as much a social product as language. The recent scientific [!] discovery, that the products of labour, so far as they are values, are but material expressions of the human labour spent in their production, marks,

indeed, an epoch in the development of the human race, but *by no means dissipates the mist* through which the social character of labour appears to us to be an objective character of the products themselves."

The italics are mine, and serve to emphasise Marx's very candid admissions of the impenetrable density of the mental fog in which he has become involved. He appears, however, to be totally unconscious that the fog is entirely of his own manufacture, obvious as this must be to every unprejudiced reader of ordinary intelligence.

CHAPTER II

MARX'S THEORY OF CAPITAL

MARX's theory of Capital is founded upon his theory of Exchange-Value. After the demonstration in the preceding chapter of the absolute absurdity of the latter theory, the proof of this statement would be sufficient to invalidate the argument by which Marx endeavours to establish the former. This would not, however, definitely demonstrate the falsity of his theory of Capital. To accomplish this we must show that it is essentially untrue, independently of its method of derivation, and that it could not, therefore, be established by any possible line of argument.

Marx introduces the subject (p. 123) by the following statement:—

"The circulation of commodities is the starting-point of capital. The production of commodities, their circulation, and that more developed form of their circulation called commerce, these form the historical groundwork

from which it rises. The modern history of capital dates from the creation in the sixteenth century of a world embracing commerce and a world embracing market."

A few lines further down we are informed that, "as a matter of history, capital as opposed to landed property, invariably takes the form at first of money." This is a somewhat startling statement to any one who has the smallest acquaintance with either political economy or actual commerce, and who has the smallest knowledge of early history; for it will be immediately evident to all such readers that what Marx means by Capital is something entirely different from the meaning of the term when employed by political economists or commercial men, viz., *that portion of the wealth of a person or community which is set aside to be employed for the production of future wealth*, instead of being directly consumed in the satisfaction of desires. Capital in this, its usual meaning, must have existed from the earliest period of man's existence. For example, the first man who domesticated sheep or cattle for increase by breeding, instead of killing and eating them as soon as captured, was a capitalist. The paragraph separating the last two quotations is evidently intended by Marx to convey some

kind of information as to what he means when he uses the word *capital*.

"If we abstract from the material substance of the circulation of commodities, that is, from the exchange of the various use-values, and consider only the economic forms produced by this process of circulation, we find its final result to be money; this final product of the circulation of commodities is the first form in which capital appears."

It would be interesting to invite Marxian Socialists to endeavour to express in their own language their interpretation of this statement. Here, as in his attempt to eliminate use-value, or utility, from exchange-value, Marx reverts to the irrational entities so much in vogue in the sophistical argumentation of the Middle Ages, such as a discussion of the differences of the entities, or ghosts, as we might call them, of a chair and of a table, that is to say, of the difference in nature of what remained in either case after abstracting everything visible or tangible in the chair or table respectively. The statement might, therefore, be paraphrased into the simple form: If we take away everything tangible from the commodities concerned in a series of exchanges, and consider only the ghosts of the commodities,

the final result will be money; this final result of the circulation of commodities is the first form in which capital appears. That is to say, capital is a product of circulation which makes its first appearance as money.

Although we may be unable to derive a very definite concept of Marxian capital from this exposition, we may obtain information from it not intended by Marx, but, nevertheless, not without importance. Marx can always express himself clearly when he has clear ideas to express, that is to say when he is not in a mental fog, and our experience in the study of the Marxian theory of exchange-value naturally suggests a similar origin for such fog, viz., Marx's obsession by some strongly desired conclusion. We shall see very shortly that this explanation is the correct one, and the conclusion predetermined in Marx's mind is that all capital is the result of robbery, a conclusion which is obviously irreconcilable with the meaning of *capital*, as opposed to *Marxian capital*.

The remainder of Chapter IV. and the whole of Chapter V. are devoted to what Marx's admirers would call argument, but which is, in fact, simply a mass of involved verbiage, extremely well adapted to the production of the

atmosphere of mental fog most favourable to the successful performance of the conjuring trick which Marx is preparing for. This confusion of thought is materially assisted by the entirely unnecessary introduction of algebraical symbols, and the manner in which they are manipulated. Their subject is what Marx terms "the circulation of commodities," and the reader is intended to accept this Marxian circulation as a true representation of the actual circulation of commodities in the operations of trade. The Marxian circulation is, however, as we shall plainly perceive, a purely imaginary process which has no relation to any reality existing outside the world of Marx's much befogged imagination. The key is provided in Marx's statement (p. 124) that "if I purchase 2000 lbs. of cotton for £100 and re-sell the 2000 lbs. of cotton for £110, I have, in fact, exchanged £100 for £110, money for money. Now it is evident that the circuit M—C—M [that is to say, money-commodity-money] would be absurd and without meaning if the intention were to exchange by this means two equal sums of money, £100 for £100. The miser's plan would be far simpler and surer; he sticks to his £100 instead of exposing it to the dangers of circulation." And (p. 138) he writes:

"Suppose, then, that by some inexplicable privilege, the seller is enabled to sell his commodities above their value, what is worth £100 for £110, in which case the price is nominally raised 10 per cent. The seller therefore pockets a surplus value of £10."

The second extract has been selected as a more concise statement of the appearance of what Marx calls surplus-value than the one (p. 128) in which he originally introduces it, and continues: "This increment or excess over the original value I call *surplus value.* The value originally advanced, therefore, not only remains intact while in circulation, but adds to itself a surplus value or expands itself. It is this movement that converts it into capital."

We have, therefore, by the simple process of eliminating the superfluous verbiage by which Marx obscures the issue, arrived at a clear and definite statement in his own words of what he means by capital. Marxian capital has nothing whatever to do with the capital employed in actual commerce. It is simply a profit made automatically without effort. If a costermonger could, without leaving his home, and without even providing himself with a barrow, pay out a sovereign with one hand

and receive 30s. in the other, the profit of 10s. so obtained would be Marxian capital. When, as in actual life, he has to provide a barrow, take it to market, then pay his sovereign, and finally take the cabbages round to his customers, in order to obtain the return of his sovereign with a profit of 10s., the 10s. is no longer Marxian capital, but well-earned trade profit.

It must be very clear to any one of the smallest intelligence that there can be very little Marxian capital, and, therefore, very few capitalists in the Marxian sense, in the ordinary work-a-day world in which we live. In the imaginary world of Marx's imagination it would be an easy matter for any one, starting with the smallest coin of the realm, to grow rapidly rich without risk and without effort. Yet this absurd fooling is the sole basis for Marx's denunciation of capital, capitalists, and the system of industry which Socialists call capitalism. The concluding paragraphs of Chapter V. form a worthy conclusion to such apologies for arguments: "It is therefore impossible for capital to be produced by circulation, and it is equally impossible for it to originate apart from circulation. *It must have its origin both in circulation and yet not in circulation.* . . .

Our friend Moneybags, who as yet is only an embryo capitalist, must buy his commodities at their value, must sell them at their value, and yet at the end of the process must withdraw more value from circulation than he threw into it at starting. His development into a full-grown capitalist must take place, *both within the sphere of circulation and without it.* These are the conditions of the problem. 'Hic Rhodus, hic salta!'"

The italics are mine in both cases. The first involves the denial of the law of contradiction, that a thing cannot, at the same time, both be and not be, one of the necessary laws of all rational thinking. Aristotle, to whom its formulation was due, rightly points out that to argue with a man who denies it is as hopeless as to attempt to argue with a vegetable. It would, indeed, be just as reasonable to address rational argument to a row of cabbages, and expect them to be convinced, as to Socialists who accept such absurdities. Marx here appears to have been so successful in enveloping his mind in mental fog as to glory even in this extremity of folly, and apparently intends to increase its effect by reiteration in the second sentence italicised. If this be his intention he has unwittingly destroyed the effect by

substituting a perfectly reasonable statement for one utterly devoid of reason. The development of wealth, and therefore of capital, as opposed to Marxian capital, can, and does, take place both within the sphere of circulation and without it, both in the sphere of distribution and in that of production. If Marx intended to reproduce his former absurdity he should have written it, both *entirely* within the sphere of circulation and *entirely* without it.

Chapter VI. is devoted to "The Buying and Selling of Labour Power," the keynote of which is the assumption as an axiomatic truth, of that oft-exposed fallacy, the more specious owing to its containing a modicum of truth, Lassalle's *Iron Law of Wages*.

According to Lassalle, whose assertion was simply an exaggeration of a view expressed by Ricardo as the result of a defective analysis, the standard of wages is invariably determined solely by the conditions that the wages of the worker must just suffice to provide a bare subsistence for himself, and to enable him to rear a sufficient progeny to maintain the labour supply at a constant value. The modicum of truth contained in it is that it expresses the minimum wage necessary to maintain a staple industry which is neither expanding

nor contracting. It has not even the merit of representing an absolute minimum under all possible circumstances. As J. A. Hobson tells us :[1]—

"These subsistence wages, required to maintain the existing supply of labour-power, may be held to constitute a first charge upon the industrial product on behalf of labour. If there is a failure anywhere to provide this subsistence, the industrial system is weakened and diminished in productivity. A wage below this subsistence point is a 'sweating-wage.'

"The payment of such a wage may sometimes be profitable to an employer or even a class of employers who have at hand a large supply of reserve labour to draw upon for the unskilled or low-skilled work which they require. Just as it was sound 'economy' for certain southern planters to work slaves to death in five or six years' labour in the rice-fields, so it may 'pay' employers in some branches of the London clothing trade to give out work to women for rates of pay insufficient to maintain them in health and physical efficiency, provided that there are plenty of other women obliged for lack of any other alternative to take this work on the same terms. All such

[1] *The Industrial System*, p. 64.

'sweating' is, however, a damage to the industrial system, which it underfeeds. Or, perhaps, a sweating trade may rather be regarded as diseased and moribund tissue in the economic system, whose lingering process of decay involves waste of labour-power, which might otherwise be properly supported, and put to healthy employment."

The general principle arrived at in Chapter X. will be found to justify us in seeking to suppress such evils in the national industry by legislative methods, provided all other available remedies have proved inadequate. The Factory Acts and the Truck Acts are examples of similarly justified methods which have been found efficient.

In the case of growing industries, the subsistence wage will, except where conditions favouring sweating prevail, be supplemented by "a wage of progressive efficiency required to evoke an increasing quantity of more effective labour-power."[1] It might be supposed that, even in a developing industry, the lowest grade, that is to say, the least efficient, labour, would only command the bare subsistence wage. The steady increase, however, for many years past, of the wages paid for all

[1] Hobson, *The Industrial System*, p. 68.

grades of labour outside the specifically sweated industries,[1] shows that the minimum wage for the lowest grades of labour is not a bare subsistence wage, but a wage which provides for subsistence at a steadily increasing "standard of subsistence," due partly to the combined efforts of the working classes, and also, very largely, to the development and pressure of public opinion in the direction of increased social co-operation, which may conveniently be abbreviated into *sociality*, through the growth of human sympathy extending beyond conventional class-limitations. Flint, in his great work, *Socialism* (p. 88), which students of the subject should "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest," comments on the subsistence law as follows: "The law of wages tends to press us down to bare subsistence, no otherwise than water tends to drown us. Water tends to drown us, and will drown us, if we do not keep out of it, or cannot swim, or make no use of ship, boat, or saving apparatus. The law of wages tends to draw us down to bare subsistence, and will draw us to that level if we do not exercise self-restraint and temperance; if we are content to be unintelligent and unskilled in our work, if we do not strive to develop our faculties and

[1] See Ireson, *The People's Progress*, chap. xii.

improve our condition; if we do not seek the best market for our labour, and if we are in other ways untrue to ourselves. Water, however, notwithstanding its tendency to drown us, drowns not one of us itself, or apart from our occasional misfortune, or want of skill, or want of prudence. And equally the law of wages, notwithstanding its tendency towards bare subsistence, drags not one of us down to that of itself, apart from our exceptional ill-luck or our insufficient intelligence or virtue, or our lack of skill or energy."

Marx dilates at great length, in Chapter VII., upon what he calls the "Labour Process." The problem is a very simple one, and since our object is to arrive at the facts, and not to envelop ourselves in such a mental fog that they may be distorted at will, may be presented very briefly. A capitalist, having provided himself with a stock of raw cotton and a building in which cotton-spinning machinery has been installed, hires a spinner. Marx then informs us (p. 165) that: "First, the labourer works under the control of the capitalist, to whom his labour belongs; the capitalist taking good care that the work is done in a proper manner, so that there is no unnecessary waste of raw material, and no wear and tear of the

implements beyond what is necessarily caused by the work."

That is to say, the capitalist, in addition to providing the raw material for the buildings, the machinery, and the labour, provides also the supervision. In other words, he provides every requisite for the manufacture of cotton yarn. Marx then continues: "Secondly, the product is the property of the capitalist, and not that of the labourer, the immediate producer." It is apparently suggested that it ought to belong to the latter, and Marx actually endeavours to persuade his readers that the spinner, after returning to the capitalist the wages paid to him, together with an amount representing merely the wear and tear of the machinery, should be entitled to the whole of the product, and that the capitalist, if he were only an honest man, ought to be quite willing to provide buildings and machinery, plan and erect the factory, and supervise the process of manufacture, without remuneration of any kind. It is so absurd as to appear incredible. We must, therefore, prove our case by following the statements presented as argument, merely stripping off the fog-producing verbiage. We find (p. 166) the following statement: "We know that the value

of each commodity is determined by the quantity of labour expended on and materialised in it, by the working-time necessary, under given social conditions, for its production. This rule also holds good in the case of the product that accrued to our capitalist as the result of the labour-process carried on for him."

Here we see the mechanism of Marx's conjuring trick, and simple enough it is, although when wrapped up in Marx's elaborate verbiage, it has proved sufficient to befog what we may call by courtesy "the mind" of the Marxian Socialist. The great majority of Socialists have never read Marx, but accept the conclusions of those who have, or who say they have, and regard them as superior beings. The trick is nothing more than the assumption suggested rather than stated in the second sentence of the paragraph quoted above, that the commercial exchange-value, or price, of the product referred to is identical with the purely imaginary Marxian exchange-value.

Marx then assumes (p. 167) that the spinner produces 10 lbs. of yarn from 10 lbs. of cotton, for which the capitalist has paid 10s., that the wear and tear of the spindle represents the value of 2s., and (p. 171) that the spinner receives 3s. for his labour. "Hence, 15s. is

an adequate price for the 10 lbs. of yarn," Marx asserts. That is to say, the provision of buildings and machinery, the planning and erection of the factory, and the supervision by the capitalist, receives no share of the product.

This, then, is the meaning of the Socialist claim that the worker is entitled to the entire produce of his work. Factories and machinery are to rise up from the ground by magic at the Socialists' bidding, while good genii from the *Arabian Nights* find the raw material on credit, pay the workman his wages every Saturday, direct and supervise his work, find a market for the product, and present the workman with the balance that remains after repaying themselves for the first cost of the raw material and the cost of upkeep of the machinery.

In the next stage of this amazing apology for argument, Marx introduces a capitalist who is no longer a pure philanthropist. He pays 20s. for 20 lbs. of raw cotton, from which 20 lbs. of yarn are produced (p. 175). The wear and tear of the spindle is now 4s., and the wages should be 6s., provided 3s. were the proper wage in the first place. Marx, however, makes him pay the spinner only

the same wages as before, viz. 3s., while the value of yarn is twice as much as before, viz. 30s. Therefore, Marx exclaims, "27s. have been transformed into 30s.; a surplus value of 3s. has been created. The trick has at last succeeded; money has been converted into capital."

Of course, the implication is that "the trick" is that of the capitalist. As a matter of fact, it obviously consists, as indicated on p. 35, in Marx's use of value as Marxian exchange-value in the first case, and as commercial exchange-value in the second, while the change in the wage-rate is clearly introduced in order to suggest that the 3s. profit has been obtained by cheating the spinner of half his due. If *value* in the second case stood, as in the first, for Marxian exchange-value, its amount would be 27s., and the capitalist would still be the pure philanthropist, or good genius, of the first example. If this thimble-rigging substitution had not been made, and value in each case meant Marxian exchange-value, it would involve the absurd result that, while in the first case

$$10 + 2 + 3 = 15,$$

in the second

$$20 + 4 + 3 = 30.$$

In the first case, Marxian arithmetic is in agreement with that which is taught in every school; while in the second case the arithmetic is purely Marxian, and proves beyond the possibility of question by any one possessing sufficient intelligence to perform the very simple addition

$$20 + 4 + 3 = 27,$$

the utter absurdity of the fallacy which the Marxian verbiage serves to conceal from his simple-minded disciples.

It might appear to the reader at the present stage that Marx is introducing a wholly unnecessary absurdity into his argument, by the assumption that no part of the *value* of the final product—in this case cotton yarn—is contributed by the building and machinery as such, but only by their wear and tear, in the present instance the wear and tear of the spindle. The critical student of Marx will find, however, that he never introduces merely gratuitous absurdities. They are invariably found to be essential to the preconceived conclusion at which he is aiming. His present object is to represent capital, in its growth as well as in its origin, as derived entirely from a *surplus-value* arising only from the robbery of wages due to the

workman. The assumption is not a necessary consequence even of Marx's fallacious theory of exchange-value as containing only crystallised labour-power. This theory would involve the conclusion that the fixed plant derives its *value* only from the labour-power which it represents, but not the assumption that the process of production can provide no remuneration for this labour. Without the introduction of this additional absurdity, however, Marx would be compelled to admit that at least a portion of the *surplus-value* arises from the plant provided by the capitalist, and cannot, therefore, consist entirely in the theft of the workman's wages.

The manner in which Marx attempts to justify this extremely absurd assumption is decidedly ingenious. He builds up what appears to be a plausible argument on the basis of the veiled implication that the contributions of the machine and of the worker who tends it, to the value of the product, can be treated separately. The worker contributes so much by his work, considered independently of the machine; the remainder is contributed by the machine, considered independently of the worker. It then seems obvious that the machine can only contribute its own value, spread over its lifetime, so that its contribution will be adequately

represented by its wear and tear during use. To illustrate by a concrete example, suppose the machine to cost, including any necessary repairs, £100; and suppose, further, that during its lifetime—of, say, ten years—the wages of the man who tends it amount to £1000; then the increase in value of the total product, beyond that of the raw material, will be the sum of the two amounts, or £1100. That is to say, Marx assumes that if the workman could add £1000 to the value of the raw material, working only with his hands throughout the whole period, he could add £1100, and £1100 only, with the aid of the machine. According to this apology for reasoning, the effect of replacing a machine of obsolete type costing £100 by one of improved type, capable of turning out the work at double the former rate, but costing only £50, and having the same lifetime, would be to reduce the value of the output over and above that of the raw material from £1100 to £1050. It must be obvious, however, to the simplest rational mind, though not to an imbecile, nor even to a dog, a horse, or a donkey, that the actual effect would be to increase the value added to the output from £1100 to £2200.

I will now set out the so-called argument in

Marx's words, merely omitting the superfluous verbiage, the only use of which is to produce the atmosphere of mental fog in which the reader might be unable to distinguish its absurdity.

"Value (p. 189) exists only in articles of utility, in objects; but leaves out of consideration its purely symbolical representation by tokens. . . . If, therefore, an article loses its utility, it also loses its value. The reason why means of production do not lose their value, at the same time that they lose their use-value, is this: they lose in the labour-process the original form of their use-value, only to assume in the product the form of a new use-value. But, however important it may be to value, that it should have some object of utility to embody itself in, yet it is a matter of complete indifference what particular object serves this purpose; this we saw when treating of the metamorphosis of commodities. Hence it follows that in the labour-process the means of production transfer their value to the product only so far as along with their use-value they lose also their exchange-value. They give up to the product that value alone which they themselves lose as means of production." "The (p. 188) maximum loss of

value that they can suffer in the process, is plainly limited by the amount of the original value with which they came into the process, or, in other words, by the labour-time necessary for their production. Therefore, the means of production can never add more value to the product than they themselves possess independently of the process in which they assist." "That (p. 191) part of capital, then, which is represented by the means of production, by the raw material, auxiliary material, and the instruments of labour, does not, in the process of production, undergo any quantitative alteration of value. I, therefore, call it the constant part of capital, or, more shortly, *constant capital.* On the other hand, that part of capital, represented by labour-power, does, in the process of production, undergo an alteration of value. It both reproduces the equivalent of its own value, and also produces an excess, a surplus-value, which may itself vary, may be more or less according to circumstances. This part of capital is continually being transformed from a constant into a variable magnitude. I, therefore, call it the variable part of capital, or shortly, *variable capital.*"

"We (p. 193) have seen that the labourer, during one portion of the labour-process,

produces only the value of his labour-power, that is, the value of his means of subsistence." "During (p. 199) the second period of the labour-process, that in which his labour is no longer necessary labour, the workman, it is true, labours, expends labour-power; but his labour being no longer necessary labour, he creates no value for himself. He creates surplus-value, which, for the capitalist, has all the charms of a creation out of nothing. This portion of the working day I name surplus labour-time, and to the labour expended during that time, I give the name of surplus-labour." "Since (p. 260), on the one hand, the values of the variable capital and of the labour-power purchased by that capital are equal, and the value of this labour-power determines the necessary portion of the working day; and since, on the other hand, the surplus-value is determined by the surplus portion of the working day, it follows that surplus-value bears the same ratio to variable capital that surplus-labour does to necessary labour. . . . The rate of surplus-value [which is expressed by this ratio] is, therefore, an exact expression for the degree of exploitation of labour-power by capital, or of the labourer by the capitalist." "The (p. 293) masses of value and surplus-value produced by different

capitals—the value of labour-power being given and its degree of exploitation being equal—vary directly as the amounts of the variable constituents, *i.e.* as their constituents transformed into living labour-power."

The absolute absurdity of the conclusion gives pause, even to Marx, and he endeavours to explain it away, or rather to obscure it, by his usual procedure of raising an atmosphere of mental fog. It will be worth while to reproduce the complete paragraph (p. 293) :—

"This law clearly contradicts all experience based on appearance. Every one knows that a cotton-spinner, who, reckoning the percentage on the whole of his applied capital, employs much constant and little variable capital, does not, on account of this, pocket more profit or surplus-value than a baker who relatively sets in motion much variable and little constant capital. For the solution of this apparent contradiction many intermediate terms are as yet wanted, as from the standpoint of elementary algebra, many intermediate terms are as yet wanted to understand that $\frac{0}{0}$ [that is to say, nothing divided by nothing] may represent an actual magnitude. Classical economy, although not formulating the law, holds instinctively to it, because it is a necessary

consequence of the general law of value. It tries to rescue the law from collision with contradictory phenomena by a violent abstraction. It will be seen later how the school of Ricardo has come to grief over this stumbling-block. Vulgar economy, which, indeed, 'has really learnt nothing' here, as everywhere, sticks to appearances in opposition to the law which regulates and explains them. In opposition to Spencer, it believes that 'ignorance is a sufficient reason.'"

The first sentence of this extraordinary paragraph might be shortened into *This law clearly contradicts all experience;* for, as Marx, with his philosophical training, was perfectly well aware, no experience possible to us can have any other basis than *appearance*, or, in philosophical language, *phenomena.* Moreover, the algebraical illustration is simply perfect, for the expression $\frac{0}{0}$ is absolutely meaningless when the symbol 0 stands for *nothing*, in the sense in which the term is always employed in everyday life, that is to say, when it means the absence of anything. The intermediate terms required for understanding how the expression $\frac{0}{0}$ may, in mathematical language, represent a magnitude standing simply for the knowledge of the special meaning which the

mathematician understands by the symbol o in this case. It is simple enough. The expression $\frac{o}{o}$ has a meaning only when the symbol o has the special meaning of an inappreciably small quantity. For one such quantity may be twice, or three times, as large as another, although either of them taken alone would be inappreciable. Further, Marx was sufficiently acquainted with elementary mathematics to be perfectly well aware of the very old pastime in which the upper form boy mystifies his juniors by apparently demonstrating all kinds of impossibilities by algebraical manipulation, the trick consisting simply in passing, undetected by the juniors, from one meaning of the symbol o to the other, just as Marx interchanges the two meanings of *value*, viz. commercial exchange-value and Marxian exchange-value. It really appears probable that Marx, desiring to impose upon the simple, and, at the same time, to retain a reputation for sanity amongst the instructed, whom he could not expect to delude, must have devised this ingenious cryptograph as one that would be perfectly clear to the learned and incomprehensible to the simple. If this surmise be correct, Marx was just quietly laughing at the Simple Simon who believes in

him. As an example of the utter absurdities deducible from Marx's contention, suppose a capitalist to expend £99,600 on a diamond, and £400 as a year's wages to a diamond-cutter for cutting it. Then suppose the capitalist to sell it for £110,000, making a profit of £10,000, representing 10 per cent. on his initial outlay. According to Marx, this sum of £10,000 must have been obtained by defrauding the diamond-cutter of a portion of his wages for the year's work. That is to say, the diamond-cutter's due for his year's work was £10,400, while the capitalist should receive no remuneration, either for his initial outlay, or for the time, trouble, and expense involved in finding a purchaser. This illustration was given in the writer's opening speech in a debate on the Marxian system, in which he represented the Anti-Socialist Union of Great Britain, and was opposed by the principal luminary of one of the Socialist parties, which had issued the challenge. The Socialist opponent evaded dealing with it until he had been challenged twice, in the writer's second and final speeches. Being thus driven to make some reference to it, he confined himself to asking, in his final reply, "If the £10,000 did not come from

the diamond-cutter's wages, where did it come from?"

Just as the Marxian exchange-value is represented in very varying proportions in actual exchange-values, so actual capitalists may correspond almost entirely, partially, or not at all, to the Marxian conception. The first class would include the comparatively few whose business is simple robbery, and who do no useful work, as, for example, the burglar, whose capital consists of an outfit of housebreaking tools, or the fraudulent company-promoter. The second class would comprise those who, while actually providing stored-up energy for useful work, and frequently also sharing in the brain-work required to direct it, secure more than their fair share, relatively, to that of the workmen whom they employ. The third class would comprise all those who obtain their fair share only, and also those who obtain less than their fair share, and, in many cases, no share at all. The unfortunate shareholders in companies paying no dividends afford instances coming within the last sub-section. In the phraseology of Marx, these unfortunates might be said to be robbed by their workmen.

Marx assumes, in contradiction to all experience, as he admits, simply on the basis of

a series of verbal sophistries, that all capitalists belong to the first class, and are simply robbers, with the possible exception of those who are deriving absolutely no income from their investments. Capital, in common with other forms of wealth, may be transferred by robbery from one holder to another. Before this can occur, however, it must first be called into being, and no process of robbery can effect this.

Socialists are usually in the habit of designating the Marxian theories by the name of *Scientific Socialism*. Their correct designation, in accordance with the principles set forth in Chapter XI., is *Superstitious Socialism*.

CHAPTER III

LAND, CAPITAL, LABOUR, AND PROFIT

We saw in the preceding chapter what absurd consequences followed from attempting a separate consideration of the portion of the total product due to a given machine and that due to the labour of the man who tends the machine. Such a separatist analysis of the problems of the industrial system is invariably found to lead to fallacies. Its apparent simplicity is attainable only at the sacrifice of its truth, and economists of very different classes have been led into error by attempting such separation of things which are in their nature inseparable. The first successful attempt, of which I am aware, to arrive at a really scientific analysis of the process of production and distribution in modern commerce, was developed by J. A. Hobson, in his excellent treatise on *The Industrial System*, which only appeared in 1909. He points out in Chapter IV. of this work, upon which most of the present chapter

is founded, that "we do not first produce a lot of wealth, and then afterwards distribute it; the production and distribution not only take place simultaneously, but are in a sense identical processes. The payments of money which constitute distribution are, in effect, orders upon the very goods which are being made or have just been made; the acts by which wealth is distributed are acts by which new productive energy is evoked and the general process of production is kept going. We cannot, therefore, properly study the production and the distribution of wealth apart, since the actual payments, which form distribution, are the efficient causes of the several industrial activities."

All industrial incomes are found to originate in the breaking up and distribution of the prices paid for services and retailed goods, or for fresh parcels of capital, so that the money which flows into a retail shop flows out again, like the main stream of a system of irrigation, from station to station, and at every station a portion is left behind. Each of these stations is itself a source from which a secondary outflow takes place, like a first set of branch ducts which flow at right angles to the course of the main stream of irrigation. From these, again,

still smaller ducts proceed, forming a network representing the complex interconnections of trade in present-day commerce. Hobson illustrates this,[1] in its first two stages, by the example of a retail shoemaker's shop, and the result may be represented in the accompanying tabular form, the left hand vertical column representing the successive stations on the main stream, while the horizontal lines represent the side ducts issuing from them :—

Retail shoe shop.	— Shop fitting and building.	— Brick-making, sawmills, &c.	...
Shoe factory.	— Machines.	— Iron and steel.	— Mines.
Tannery.	— Vats, &c.	— Iron and steel.	— Mines.
Cattle market.	— Sheds and slaughter-houses.	— Building trades.	— Mines and farms.
Farm.	— Tool-making, building, &c.	— Iron and steel.	— Mines.

At each one of the stations and sub-stations land is required for the buildings, &c. ; capital for the erection of the buildings, the provision of machinery, farm-stock, &c.; wages for labour; profit for the management, requiring business and other ability, which must be provided by the undertaker, that is to say the business

[1] *The Industrial System*, p. 16.

organiser, either in his own person, or by payments out of the share which would otherwise accrue to him as profit. The excess of inflow over outflow at each station, constituting its income, is therefore, in all cases, broken up into four distinct portions—rent, interest, wages, and profit; payable for land, capital, labour, and management, respectively. Rent, interest, and wages are all periodical payments made for the steady influx of productive energy in various forms, and the continued maintenance of industry at a constant level requires this steady influx, while a growing industry requires an ever-increasing influx of one or all of these factors. Some of the functions of the management, or of the undertaker, may be regarded as supplying the requisite influx of mental labour-power, the price of which would be determinable in somewhat the same manner as the payment for other labour, but the sum total of these functions is of a far more complex character, corresponding with the complex and essentially uncertain, and therefore speculative, character of profit. This will make it necessary to consider profit apart from the others. This analysis of industry indicates productivity, or the rate at which product can be turned out, as the determining factor of the value of land, capital,

and labour. It is obvious, however, that these three factors are not mutually independent. If there be two machines, having lives of equal length, of equal initial cost, occupying equal floor space, and absorbing equal driving power, but one of which turns out 100 pieces of work while the other turns out 50 for an equal expenditure of labour, the former will be more than twice as valuable as the latter. How much more will depend, however, on the standing charges of the business and other details. It would, therefore, be impossible to arrive at a correct and detailed analysis of the industrial process by the separate consideration of rent, interest, and wages. We can, however, obtain, in this manner, a very considerable insight into their general nature, into the character of their mutual relations, and into the manner in which the product of industry is distributed, in the shape of income, to the several factors of production.

As wages form a first charge, under existing conditions, upon all industrial undertakings, we will consider them first. We shall see, in Chapter V., that under a Socialist Government labour would only obtain the residue after all the other charges, including the maintenance of a horde of state officials, which would take

the place of the undertaker's profit, had been fully satisfied. We saw in Chapter II. that the bare subsistence wage which would suffice to maintain the labourer and to enable him to rear a sufficient family to keep the labour supply constant, would, in a stationary industrial system, determine the minimum rate of influx of productive energy, in the form of commodities, requisite to maintain the supply of the lowest grade of labour. The higher grades of labour, requiring a more rapid expenditure of physical energy, because demanding more skill, or mental exertion, or involving greater responsibility, usually require a higher standard of living, and therefore a larger income. Moreover, man is not, as represented by Karl Marx and the majority of Socialists, a mere machine that will work and act satisfactorily in every way if only the external conditions are suitably adjusted, that is to say, if he is properly fed, clothed, housed, and amused. Man, even in the lowest stages of development, is essentially a purposive being working towards more or less conscious ends. He therefore requires, in order to provide a stimulus to his will, a higher rate of payment than would merely replace his bodily wear and tear. The actual subsistence wage will include

this stimulus; and as this moral element becomes increasingly important as the grade of labour rises, it plays a leading part in determining the different wages of different classes of workers. Any kind of true education, that is to say, any training which enlarges the mental and moral outlook, increases the strength of this moral element, both by increasing the felt requirements of the individual, and by creating a public opinion in support of their satisfaction, in other words, by developing sociality. It is this actual subsistence wage for every grade of worker which, under present conditions, may be regarded as constituting a first charge upon the industrial product on behalf of labour. Any wage below this limit is a *sweating* wage which, as we saw in Chapter II., underfeeds, and therefore damages, the industrial system.

The increased amount of labour-power required for the extension of an industrial system may be obtained, either by bringing a larger number of workers into the industry, or by inducing and enabling the existing workers to increase their output of labour-power. Both of these methods operate by a rise of wages above the subsistence rate. In the former case, this will bring in a lower grade of workers, who will now be able to earn the previously

existing minimum subsistence wage for any given kind of work. In the second case, the increased wage is necessary to induce the workers to put forth greater effort, and to replace the resulting increase in wear and tear. Here also a lower grade of work will usually be brought into play, as the rate of output is generally lower when men are working overtime. In either case the inferiority may consist either in the quantity or the quality of the output, or in both. If it be an increase in quality instead of quantity that is required, higher wages will still be necessary, both in order to provide the mental stimulus for the acquisition of increased skill, and the higher standard of living thereby demanded. As Hobson observes:[1] "If a trade is to grow simultaneously both in size and in character of work, both stimuli of higher pay must be applied. This is the real significance of the rise of rate of pay which has taken place in the skilled cotton trade of Lancashire during the last half-century, as also in many other manufactures where a growth in volume of work has been accompanied by improved skill, care, regularity, and responsibility." We see, therefore, that in a growing industry, two necessary

[1] *The Industrial System*, p. 68.

payments have to be assigned to labour out of the industrial income—a simple wear-and-tear fund, and an improvement fund.

Let us now turn to the consideration of capital, in the concrete form of the buildings, machines, stock, &c., necessary to industry. Here again we find a wear-and-tear fund, generally known as a depreciation fund, and an improvement fund. If an industrial system completely equipped with all such requisites could be brought into existence by a miracle, as the palace of Aladdin was built, in a night, by the genii of the lamp, in the *Arabian Nights* fairy tale, the depreciation fund would be the only one necessary, and would then correspond to the entire subsistence wage of labour. This, as was pointed out in Chapter II., is exactly what Karl Marx does assume, but in the present chapter we are dealing with commerce as it exists in the world we live in, and not with a system which might be pictured in an imaginary fairyland. We therefore have to consider the cost of establishing the industrial system as well as the cost of its maintenance. In the case of labour it is perfectly obvious that there is nothing corresponding to this cost of establishment. In order, therefore, to bring the various forms of material capital, buildings,

machinery, &c., into existence, a payment for the requisite effort of saving must be included in the maintenance fund of capital. For we have seen that capital is simply another name for savings, consisting of wealth which is put aside for the purpose of production, instead of being spent, as acquired, on the satisfaction of immediate wants. This periodical payment, included in the maintenance fund of capital, is what is called interest. Its amount must be sufficient to stimulate sufficient saving to satisfy the requirements of industry. It will therefore increase with the demand, and diminish as the supply increases, just as in the case of wages. At the present time the rate of interest, where there is perfect safety, is somewhere about 3 per cent. per annum. That is to say, a user of machine tools could obtain the use of a lathe costing £100 for an annual payment of £3, provided he maintained the lathe in repair at his own expense, and that the lender could be perfectly certain, whenever he desired, of either having the lathe returned and sold for £100, or of securing the return of the £100 in some other manner. This certainly would not be obtainable in any ordinary industrial company or private firm, and therefore an added payment would have

to be made to compensate for the risk. This added payment is not really interest on capital, though in ordinary every-day language it is so called. It is really of the nature of a bet, and is proportioned to the risk. The more chance an investor runs of losing his capital the larger must this additional payment be, in the event of the success of the undertaking. The difference in these additions to real interest, according to the risk incurred, correspond in every respect to the different odds which a backer can obtain in a race, according to the estimated chance of success or failure of the horse he selects. The interest of 3 per cent., or £3 per annum, for the use of a £100 lathe, has nothing to do with this. It would be practically realised if an investor provided a £100 lathe for Woolwich Arsenal, by lending the Government £100 at 3 per cent.

Socialists often argue that a minimum interest is not requisite to stimulate saving, since a wealthy man would be obliged to seek investment for his capital, even if the interest obtainable were much less than 3 per cent., as the lower interest would be preferable to allowing it to lie idle, and gradually spending his capital. They are ignorant of the fact that the amount of capital which would be available

under such conditions would form an extremely small proportion of the amount required, and employed, in existing industry. The greater portion is derived from small investments, representing savings which have involved much effort of abstinence, and the price paid for the savings effected with comparative ease is determined by the stimulus required to induce the requisite abstinence on the part of those among the investors to whom the effort of saving is greatest.

The demand for additional capital on the part of a growing industry produces a rise in interest, which operates by giving rise to greater saving effort, inducing some to save who have never saved before, and some who saved before, to save, by increased abstinence, at a higher rate. A rise of interest will also intensify the use of existing capital, for example, by speeding up machines or by increasing the number of shifts, and so running the machines for more hours a day. Either of these intensive methods involves increased depreciation, and it will be observed that both the extensive and intensive effects of a rise of interest bear a very close resemblance to the extensive and intensive effects of a rise in wages.

As in the cases of labour and capital, so also in the case of land, there are two necessary payments to be made out of the industrial income—a simple wear-and-tear fund, and an improvement fund. The latter will include all such expenditure as is requisite for road-making, fencing, drain-making, establishing irrigation systems, and clearing waste land and preparing it for economic use; while the former will include all expenditure on the maintenance of such works on the land and for maintaining the fertility of farm land by periodic ploughing, manuring, &c. That is to say, land, as far as maintenance and improvements are concerned, may be regarded simply as a form of concrete capital.

Each one of these payments made to labour, capital, and land, is an absolutely necessary cost of production, and if an industrial system in which no other payments were made, produced only sufficient to maintain itself in a stationary condition without requiring any management, there could be no dispute as to the distribution of the product. For if the portion accruing to either of the three factors were increased above the necessary amount, it could only be by depriving one of the factors of what was absolutely necessary for its maintenance.

Usually, however, an industrial system produces more than is necessary for its own maintenance; in other words, it produces a surplus, and it is with regard to the distribution of this surplus that disputes arise. Unless such a surplus were produced, the system of industry could not continue to exist, for there are further necessary payments to be made out of the product; but no one of them has an irreducible minimum determined by the conditions of the industry itself, and below which it cannot fall without involving the destruction of the industry. The management must have sufficient remuneration to secure its continuance with undiminished efficiency, or the industry would cease to be self-maintaining. The State must take a sufficient share of the product to secure the efficient maintenance of public functions. The landowner must also receive some inducement in the form of rent to allow his land to be made use of. The Socialist and the land nationaliser found upon this fact an argument against the individual ownership of land. In so doing, they, however, ignore the facts that the landowner has acquired his land either in exchange for some other form of capital or as direct payment for services to the community, and

that the system of individual ownership of land has been found, by universal experience, the most efficient method of securing the greatest development of its productivity at the least cost to the community. The only reason for including rent in the surplus, instead of in the necessary cost of the industrial system, is that, unless the landowner can employ his land for his own satisfaction, he will give the use of it for whatever rent he can obtain. There is therefore no irreducible minimum rent for land corresponding to the minimum interest requisite to evoke the savings which constitute capital. It is obvious that the rent of land, other circumstances being equal, will vary according to its productivity, as, for example, its fertility or the nature and disposition of the minerals below the surface. It will also, in every case, depend on the relation of the demand to the supply, so that as there is no definite minimum rent for land, rent must always be considered as a *scarcity rate* of payment. Wages and the interest on capital will also demand *scarcity rates* whenever the supply of labour or capital is less than the demand. In this manner a sudden and extensive development of industry will usually cause a rise in the rate of interest. The

enhanced price of patented machinery, which pays for the inventive ability that created it, affords a good example of the operation of *scarcity rates* in the case of concrete capital. A startling example of the extent to which *scarcity rates* may operate in the case of wages is afforded by the wages paid to the men who operate the iron and steel rolling mills. These men earn an average wage of something like £20 a week for simply manipulating the hydraulic levers which shift the hot iron and steel passing through the mills and control the pressure on the rolls. The reason is that comparatively few men can acquire the delicacy of touch and the judgment requisite to produce just sufficient pressure, and not too much, which would break the rolls. If one of these, costing about £100 each, is broken before its time, the cost is stopped out of the man's wages, but this does not often happen. The scarcity is much enhanced by the limitation in the number of apprentices which the men's union is able to enforce. I believe that comparatively few of these men ever save anything out of their high wages beyond their union and club subscriptions.

The profit of an industrial concern is

represented by the remainder of the surplus profit after all these additional necessary payments have been made. This accrues to the undertaker, and may be considered as essentially a payment for ability. Profit does not constitute the whole payment made for ability, for we have already seen how inventive ability receives remuneration in the form of a *scarcity rate* of interest on concrete capital, and there are other forms of ability which find their reward in the same form, and others again which receive it in the form of comparatively high salaries, which are simply *scarcity rate* wages. Even business ability frequently obtains its remuneration in the form of *scarcity rate* wages, and sometimes in the form of *scarcity rates* of interest. The reward of business ability, however, more usually assumes the form of profit, and profit may be considered as being mainly devoted to the payment of business ability, partially also to the payment of other forms of ability, and to a very considerable extent, to payments which take the place of interest, wages, and rent. The business ability demanded for the initiation, development, and management of an industrial undertaking is of a very wide and varied character, and Hobson classifies the

work of the undertaker[1] under four main divisions.

1. "He plans in his mind the working of a business, selecting among existing methods, lines of goods, markets, one best adapted to his ability, and his access to the other factors of production.

2. "He buys the various quantities of the different factors of production required to carry out his plan.

3. "He organises the factors for the various processes of production.

4. "He markets the product."

Though each of these functions may be regarded as productive, in as far as it is essential to the present working of industry, it is to the organising function that we must look as the chief *objective* source of profit. A single unit of labour-power left to find capital for land or fruitful action, a single unit of capital seeking profitable use in conjunction with a worker, an acre of land looking round for a farmer, can produce very little. The right number of each of these different units, properly combined and directed, can produce much. The difference between the sum of the little products that would accrue if the units

[1] *The Industrial System*, p. 117.

worked singly by and for themselves (with such assistance from a unit of another factor as a single unit could itself acquire), and that which accrues from their co-operative working under skilled guidance, is the product of organisation, and constitutes the economic fund out of which profit is paid.

CHAPTER IV

THE MARXIAN DOCTRINE OF A CLASS WAR

It is obvious that Marx's attempted division of the whole body composing a modern industrial community into two distinct classes, those who live by work and those who live by robbing the workers, would necessarily lead to irreconcilable hostility between the two classes—the robbers and the robbed. He also shows that if, as he endeavoured unsuccessfully to maintain, this robbery were the one and only source of capital, it would follow, as a logical consequence of the observed fact that the amount of concrete capital in the world is steadily increasing, that the robbers must be growing steadily richer, and the robbed steadily poorer. A time would therefore necessarily arrive when the ever-increasing misery of the workers would drive them into armed rebellion against the robbers. That Marx did not hesitate to draw these conclusions from his absurd theories, and to express them with perfect

clearness, is shown by the following extracts from "The Communist Manifesto," which was signed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, and published in the year 1872. It will be noted that the worker is called a *proletarian*, and the robber a *bourgeois*.

"The serf in feudal times raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty-bourgeois attained the position of a bourgeois under the yoke of feudal absolutism. The modern worker, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks even deeper beneath the social conditions of his own class. The labourer becomes the pauper, and pauperism increases even more rapidly than population and wealth (p. 15). . . . The history of all past society is the history of class antagonisms, which took different forms in different epochs. But whatever form they may have taken, the exploitation of one section of society by another is a fact common to all previous centuries. . . . The first step in the working-class revolution is the raising of the proletariat to the position of ruling class, the victory of Democracy. The proletariat will use its political power to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, *i.e.* of the

proletariat organised as the ruling class, and to increase as rapidly as possible the total mass of productive forces. This, naturally, cannot be accomplished at first except by despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the bourgeois conditions of production (p. 20). . . . Political power, properly speaking, is the organised power of one class for the purpose of oppressing another. If the proletariat, forced by its struggle against the bourgeoisie to organise as a class, makes itself by a revolution the ruling class, and as the ruling class destroys by force the old conditions of production, it destroys along with these conditions of production the conditions of existence of class antagonism, class in general, and therewith its own domination as a class" (p. 21).

The analysis of Chapter III., showing the nature of modern industry, makes it perfectly clear that Society cannot possibly be divided into two classes with conflicting interests, as Marx maintains, and it is not surprising that a doctrine founded on such palpable absurdities as the Marxian theories of exchange-value and capital should be found to have no basis in actual fact. This analysis shows that while there are certainly conflicting interests requiring adjustment in the various factors of production,

such conflicts of interest can no more divide a community into essentially hostile camps than the conflicting interests involved in every transaction between a tradesman and his customers can be held to show that there must be irreconcilable hostility between them. It would be just as sensible to attribute the failure of a tradesman to the increasing number of his customers, as to argue that the growth of capital must involve the impoverishment of the workers. The assertion that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer is in absolute contradiction to experience. This is convincingly demonstrated in Ireson's valuable little volume, *The People's Progress*, to which the reader may be advised to refer, especially to Chapter XII. It will be sufficient here to reproduce an extract from the Report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the Depression of Trade (Cd. 4893, p. 16), which appears on the opening page of that chapter :—

"It would appear that the number of persons with incomes of less than £2000 a year has increased at a more rapid rate than the population, while the number of persons above £2000 has increased at a less rapid rate, and the number with incomes above £5000 has actually diminished; and further, that the lower

the income, the more rapid the rate of increase. We think, therefore, there is distinct evidence that profits are becoming more widely distributed among the classes engaged in trade and industry."

Socialists, however, do not appear to concern themselves largely with facts, except to misrepresent them. They prefer fallacious theories which can be moulded into the shapes required to lead to the conclusions which they desire to arrive at. It was as late as 1906 that the translation of Ferri's *Socialism and Positive Science* was published by the Independent Labour Party, and given the place of honour as the opening volume of *The Socialist Library*, edited by Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald. On p. 145 of this volume, after a discussion of Marx's essentially irrational materialistic theory of Society, from which extracts will be given in Chapter VII., we find the following statement:—

"The other sociological theory by which Karl Marx has really dissipated the clouds which obscured till now the heaven of Socialist aspirations, and which has furnished to scientific Socialism the political compass for steering itself with complete assurance in the contentions of the life of every day, is the great historic law of the *class struggle*."

Some editorial notes from Mr. Ramsay MacDonald on this and other equally abject nonsense, in which Ferri's work abounds, would have been of value in preventing uninstructed readers from being deluded by it. Apparently, however, he then agreed with it, and has since discovered his error. In his own work, *Socialism and Society*, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald expresses far more sensible views upon this absurd Marxian doctrine. These show by implication, although I have not been able to discover any direct statement to that effect, that he is in no way deluded by the equally absurd Marxian theories of exchange-value and capital. In reference to the doctrine of the class war he observes (p. 124) :—

"Such a view is both inaccurate as to the facts it assumes, and misleading as a guide for action. In the first place it is not true that there are only two great economic classes in the community—the assumption which is constantly made by those who hold to the class war explanation of progress. Marx was so anxious to separate himself from 'bourgeoisie' economists that he would on no account recognise the conflicting interests of rent and of profits."

He also points out that "'The Communist

Manifesto,' even in its day, admitted as much, but made no place for the fact in its theories," and that "some of his [Marx's] followers, without allowing for the admission in their systems, concede the antagonism, as for instance, when Mr. Hyndman describes the trinity of labourers, farmers, and landlords as being 'as compact a little set of antagonisms as any in our society,' and later on when he states that 'the only results of the confiscation of competitive rents or royalties by the State . . . would . . . be the strengthening of the hands of the capitalist class.' This is true only on condition that there is an economic antagonism between landlords and capitalists as well as between capitalists and workmen, and that the 'class war' is carried on not between two, but at least three armies, between any two of which there may be treaties of peace and offensive alliances. But further, any idea which assumes that the interests of the proletariat are so simply opposed to those of the bourgeoisie as to make the proletariat feel an economic oneness, is purely formal and artificial. It is a unification arrived at only by overlooking many differences and oppositions, which have been growing for some time rather than diminishing. The economic structure of society is simplified out of all

recognition when it is described as a contest between two economic classes, and the political problems of democracy are still more distorted under the guise of simplification when they are stated as being nothing more than an effort to give political form to this economic antagonism."

Further on (pp. 137–144) he points out that the preaching of a class war is opposed to all the principles of the sociality which Socialists profess to stand for, and observes :—

"What matters is the motive power which effected the emancipation. If that power is the conflict of interests, it will reappear in the new regime, and if it finds no complete class to infuriate, it will enter class subsections, which will then be prepared to fly at each other's throats. The assumption that by a class triumph Society is to emerge from the epoch of class conflict and sail gaily away upon the calm waters of fraternity, can be held only by those who have not ceased to believe in the magical and irrational.

"The antagonisms in Society which result in organic change of a progressive nature are not merely economic. They are also intellectual and moral. . . . The richest possession of any man is an approving conscience. . . . Everybody does not pile up riches on

his inner lights to smother them. Even if we regard economics as the mainspring by which history moves, that does not prevent us from recognising that only by a combination of intellectual guidance and economic needs does historical change become one and the same thing with progress. The scheme upon which humanity evolves to higher and more humane stages of existence is either rational or it is not. If it is not, all organised attempts to hasten reform and make it effective—Socialism included—are waste effort. If it is rational, then progress becomes a matter of intellectual conviction, and man, seeking intellectual peace as well as economic security, will have to choose which he is to pursue. . . . The economic motive must be led by the light of reason or morality—as, indeed, it has always been when it is a factor in progress. This line of thought appears to overlook the article in the Marxian creed that Socialism is inevitable. But the industrial and economic inevitability of Socialism is a mere fancy. . . . Human evolution is a stretching out, not a being pushed forward. . . . The consciousness which it [Socialism] seeks to quicken is not one of economic class solidarity, but one of social unity of growth towards organic wholeness."

This is excellent except for one fault, and that is a serious one. What is here called Socialism is not only not Socialism, but is absolutely incompatible with Socialism. It is simply what I have called Sociality, and could only be termed Socialism in the sense that the Sociality of Maurice, Kingsley, and Westcott was known as Socialism. The term *Socialism* has now come to be identified with the principle of the State ownership, and management on behalf of the community, of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. It is therefore entirely misleading to employ it in its earlier meaning of Sociality. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has never succeeded in apprehending the fact, which will be conclusively demonstrated in Part II., that Socialism, in the sense in which it is now generally understood, is essentially incompatible with the development of Sociality. It is only in the concluding chapter of some 20 pages out of the 214 pages of *Socialism and Society*, that its author even attempts to argue that Sociality is attainable by the procedure embodied in the now accepted meaning of the term *Socialism*. His arguments are as weak and ineffective as might be anticipated in any attempt to reconcile such absolutely

irreconcilable opposition as exists between Sociality and Socialism. His final conclusion (p. 210) is that "at the present moment all that the Socialist need do is to lay down and defend as a general principle that reward for work should be certain and sufficient, and that full opportunity should be given to each adult to work at some remunerative employment." But this is not Socialism, and has nothing to do with Socialism. The Socialist who would work intelligently on these lines would have to abandon his Socialism and co-operate in the advancement of true social progress on the course indicated by the reason which is guided by experience.

Mr. MacDonald has evidently not yet realised this, but that does not necessarily mean that he never will. *Socialism and Society* was published in 1908, and his preface to *Socialism and Positive Science* was written in 1905, and in that time he has travelled far; he has, indeed, passed from unreason to comparative reason containing but a few traces of his former unreason. He has abandoned the irrationality of materialistic determinism for the view of the world which regards it as instinct with reason. He tells us on p. vii. of his preface to Ferri's work, and

in reference thereto: "The chief value of this study, however, is the claim that it so successfully makes, that the Socialist conception of human progress and of the social conditions which are to be the characteristics of the next, the Socialist, stage in that evolution, is not only in accordance with the processes which Darwin proved to be the method of the development of life from the Moneron to man, but is those very processes themselves applied to human society with such modifications as are necessitated by the fact that they now relate to life, which can consciously adapt itself to those circumstances, and aid natural evolution by economising in experimental waste. Thus, Socialism is naught but Darwinism economised, made definite, become an intellectual policy, applied to the conditions of human society."

This claim, be it noted, was made in 1905 on behalf of Marxian Socialism, in all its naked irrationality, founded on materialistic determinism, and proceeding through the absurd apologies for economic reasoning dealt with in Chapters I. and II., to the demonstrable falsities which, as we have seen above, have been utterly condemned, in 1908, by MacDonald himself. Ferri asserts (p. 109) that "man is

a machine," and makes it abundantly clear throughout his work that he accepts the logically necessary result of this assertion, and of the materialism on which it is founded, that the system of nature, itself essentially irrational, can in no way be modified by any action of man. He maintains, however, that the study of the machine of nature, more particularly of that portion which is called human society, shows that the course of action of that machine will ultimately shape society in accordance with the Socialistic scheme. Another statement by MacDonald, occurring on p. vi. of the same preface, I had on a previous occasion[1] attributed to insincerity, but in the light of the radical change of view exhibited in *Socialism and Society*, I now interpret it differently. "It may be true logically, as Ferri asserts, that once the evolutionary process is granted, it is as easy to swallow the gnat of eternal and self-existent force and matter as it is to swallow the camel of an eternal and self-existent God."

We may pass over the use of the expression self-existent force, which is scientifically unintelligible, as it can be rectified by replacing the

[1] *Report of a Debate on Theism and the Problem of the Universe*, pp. 12–14.

term *force* by the term *energy*, which alone could have any meaning here. The confusion between force and energy is a common error with those who have never had any training in physical science. The statement now appears rather in the light of a regretful admission that Mr. MacDonald could not then quite see his way to dissent from Ferri's position, as the arguments which he now sees to be fallacious then appeared to him to be almost, if not entirely, incontrovertible. He then believed reluctantly that the progressive changes in society were merely economic; he now sees that they are also intellectual and moral. He then believed evolution to be irrational and insusceptible to human influence; he now regards it as rational and capable of modification by human reason. He then believed that human evolution is a being pushed forward and not a stretching out. He now believes and asserts the converse. The views of Marx and Ferri are comparable to those of a gardener who, seeing the more vigorous plants encroaching on the less vigorous ones, and being utterly ignorant of the fact that any interposition is possible, predicts the advent of a sandstorm which, by converting the entire garden into a desert, will restrict such growth

as it does not destroy, and gradually cause the vegetation to accommodate itself to the new and arid conditions, and enable him to describe the newly-made desert as an earthly paradise. MacDonald may be compared with an intelligent under-gardener who, at first impressed by what he deemed the wisdom of his elders, has now discovered its folly. He now recognises that what is requisite is only some pruning of unduly exuberant growth, and the supply of more water to the roots of those plants that were dying for the lack of it. He has not yet, however, attained to fulness of wisdom, for he seeks to find the water by digging in the arid sand bunker of Socialism. Perhaps, in time, he may learn to seek it in the well of reasoned experience.

CHAPTER V

SOCIALIST GROUPS AND AIMS

ALL the various parties and individuals who are included under the comprehensive term *Socialists* are agreed upon one proposition, and upon one proposition only. They all unite in asserting that *the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange*, would provide a universal panacea for all the ills of society, in so far as they depend upon economic conditions.[1] They are not by any means agreed upon the nature of the ills which are to be cured. Some existing conditions are so obviously harmful that even the least intelligent Socialists agree with the advocates of true social progress on the lines of reason and experience, in desiring their extinction. In other cases, what one section desires to suppress, other sections desire to promote. They are all agreed, however, that the socialisation of the means of

[1] We shall see in Chapter VII. that the Marxian Socialist, who calls himself "scientific," maintains that they can depend on nothing but the economic conditions.

production, distribution, and exchange, would accomplish the desired end, in spite of the fact that they cannot agree upon the nature of that end. In proclaiming the virtues of this wonderful panacea, each distinct party or individual adds the proviso, either explicitly or as a mental reservation—provided it be carried out in the right way—and, of course, the right way means the way advocated by himself or his party. Almost every Socialist believes that if this socialisation were effected in any manner other than that prescribed by himself or his own party, its effect would be harmful instead of beneficial. The only beneficial way is his way, or the way of his party. The more cool-headed Socialists implore and beseech the others to reserve the expression of these differences of opinion for occasions when Socialists only are present, to unite in advocating the one fundamental proposition upon which all are agreed, and to fight out their differences among themselves. The first piece of advice is not always acceptable—the latter is nearly always so. The abuse which Socialists reserve for non-Socialists is politeness itself compared to what they lavish upon each other. This is Socialist unity. It closely resembles the unity existing between the quacks who advertise

"pills that cure all ills." They all agree that pills will cure all ills, but each maintains that they must be his own pills, and that those advertised by his rivals are little better than poison. There can be no manner of doubt that, if the pill vendors found it to their advantage, they would willingly agree to use the same outer coverings for all their pills, and to vend them in parcels of similar size and shape. This superficial uniformity has already been attained by the Socialist in the socialistic formula, but the differences, which are hidden from the extremely simple by the uniformity of garb, are every whit as great as the differences in the ingredients contained in the different pills.

To consider all the various Socialist schemes that have been propounded, or even those which are now being offered, would not merely far exceed the limits which can be allotted to the present chapter, but would fill a very much larger volume than the book of which this chapter forms a part. For practically every Socialist who aspires to be a leader has, to a greater or less extent, views of his own to propound, and very commonly he regards these particular views of his own, however little real originality they may contain, as forming the

most essential portion of the scheme which he advocates. It is a difficult matter to devise anything approaching a satisfactory classification of Socialists. It is not only that the differences are so numerous and so great. The different opinions do not seem to group themselves into any coherent shapes, for a Socialist is scarcely to be found whose opinions do not include more or less incongruous elements which, when extracted from him and analysed, are found to be logically incompatible with one another. There are comparatively few Socialists, properly so-called, that is to say, who accept the socialisation formula, who do not cite Marx with reverence as the great apostle of Socialism. There are, indeed, Marxian Socialists who accept his atheistic basis and fallacious economics to the fullest extent, and look forward to universal atheism, and what they call free-love, as the future earthly paradise of humanity. What Socialists mean by free-love is explained by Jules Guesde, a French Socialist leader, who affirms that the family is now only an odious form of property, and must be transformed or abolished;[1] and he goes on to express the opinion that under Socialism the

[1] J. Guesde, *Le Cathéchisme Socialiste*, pp. 72–79.

family relationship would be reduced to the relation between mother and child, until the latter was weaned. Professor Lecky[1] quotes a leading French Socialist writer, Gabriel Deville, to the effect that "when property is transformed, and only after that transformation, marriage will lose its reason for existence, and boys and girls may then freely, and without fear of censure, listen to the wants and promptings of their nature." The state of things here suggested would represent conditions lower than those now prevalent amongst the lowest races of savages, and lower even than amongst those animals where the male parent joins the female in the protection of their offspring. Many Socialist leaders in this country have shown that their ideals are of similar character, though usually expressed in more guarded terms.

The Social Democratic Party form the chief body of Marxian Socialists in this country, but though building upon Marx's theories, they generally refrain from such open expression of unpopular opinions, and are usually prepared to abandon any one of Marx's economic positions when faced with argument obviously

[1] *Democracy and Liberty.* Cabinet Edition, vol. ii. pp. 348–49.

incontrovertible. This does not, however, prevent them from maintaining that their abandonment of the particular doctrine in question does not materially affect their position. And very often it does not prevent their reproducing the disproved argument under more favourable conditions, that is to say, in the absence of any one capable of disproving it. There is one small party, numbering only a few hundreds, but calling itself "The Socialist Party of Great Britain," which sticks to Marx through thick and thin. A member of this party, when he finds it impossible to evade a destructive argument, usually takes refuge in asserting that Marx is right in spite of it, that is to say, he admittedly prefers to trust Marx rather than his own reasoning powers.

The acceptance of Marx's theories does not then provide any definite means of effecting a classification of Socialists into types. Nor do the labels which Socialists affix to themselves afford anything more satisfactory. The best attempt at classification which I can devise is to separate them into the three following roughly defined groups: (1) Socialists who think we are not governed enough, and who therefore aim at increasing the power of the State. These

we may call *State Socialists*. (2) Socialists who think we are too much governed, and who wish to diminish, and ultimately extinguish, the power of the State. These we may call by the name they have chosen for themselves, *Communal Anarchists*. (3) Socialists whose aims are too vague and indefinite to fall into either Class I. or Class II. These we may call *Nebulous Socialists*, for a nebula is a mass of gas of extreme tenuity, possessing no defined boundary.

Outside these are two groups of what we may call Socialist camp-followers. They are distinguished from the true Socialists by the fact that they do not unreservedly accept the socialisation formula. In the districts with respect to which I have had sufficient experience to form an opinion, they appear largely to outnumber the true Socialists, and I can see no reason to suppose that this does not hold good generally. They usually support by their votes and contributions any Socialist candidates and organisations with whom they may happen to come in contact. One of these groups is actuated by the belief that the socialisation of some industries would be beneficial. The belief is usually founded upon instances of the successful municipal operation of such undertakings as Electric Tramways, and upon the

example of the State management of the Post Office, and is most generally the result of highly coloured accounts given by Socialist speakers. The other group consists of people who are captivated by the idea of brotherhood and social co-operation, or Sociality, and who have accepted without question the Socialist assertions that Socialism and social co-operation are identical. There is, as might have been anticipated, no hard and fast division between these two groups, many persons being actuated by both these beliefs. Many of these camp-followers ultimately become true Socialists if left to the unopposed influence of Socialist teachers, but a large proportion can readily be detached from the Socialist camps by giving them the opportunity of learning the true facts. There is, perhaps, no more effective method of opening the eyes of the camp-follower class than a discussion in their hearing between a Marxian Socialist, the more extreme the type the better, and an opponent of Socialism who knows what he is talking about, and who also genuinely believes in the great importance of Sociality to real social progress. The great body of so-called Christian Socialists really belong to the second group of camp-followers, but a few accept the socialisation formula, and

are then usually found amongst the Socialists in Class III. Class I. almost monopolises the intellectual ability of the Socialist parties. It is mainly represented by the Social Democratic Party and the Fabian Society, but a considerable proportion of the members of the latter are prepared to pose as Socialists of any type, or as non-Socialists, provided such procedure be calculated to further the ends they have in view.[1] The majority of the Independent Labour Party are State Socialists. The leaders are perfectly agreed as to the object of their immediate aim, to increase the power of the State, and to extend its sphere of action, by every available method, with the ultimate view of centralising all power and all initiative in the hands of the executive government; in other words, the establishment of a despotism in which they would be the rulers. They are perfectly outspoken when writing for Socialists. They are quite ready to follow the ordinary democratic method of manipulating majorities in order to coax the workers into the slave-pen prepared for them. They are also quite ready, if opportunity offer, to drive them in with the whip. As Mr. Belfort Bax, one of

[1] See *Fabian Tract*, No. 41; or, *The Case Against Socialism*, p. 53.

the leaders of the Social Democratic Party, writes :—

"The Socialist has a distinct aim in view. If he can carry the initial stages towards its realisation by means of the count-the-heads majority, by all means let him do so. If, on the other hand, he sees the possibility of carrying a salient portion of his programme by trampling on this majority, by all means let him do this also." [1]

A few pages earlier (p. 122) he had written :—

"The only public opinion, the only will of the majority, which has any sort of claim on the recognition of the Socialist in the present day is that of the majority of those who have like aspirations with him . . . in other words, the will of the majority of the European Socialist Party."

When the workers have been driven into the slave-pen, they are to be kept there. Mr. Sydney Webb, a leading Fabian, writes : [2]—

"Instead of converting every man into an independent producer, working when he likes and as he likes, we aim at enrolling every able-bodied person directly in the service of the community, for such duties and under such

[1] *Ethics of Socialism*, pp. 127, 128.
[2] *Basis and Policy of Socialism*, p. 71.

kind of organisation, local or national, as may be suitable to his capacity and social function. In fact, so far are we from seeking to abolish the wage system, so understood, that we wish to bring under it all those who now escape from it—the employers, and those who live on rent or interest—and so make it universal. If a man wants freedom to work or not to work just as he likes, he had better emigrate to Robinson Crusoe's island, or else become a millionaire. To suppose that the industrial affairs of a complicated industrial State can be run without strict subordination and discipline, without obedience to orders, and without definite allowances for maintenance, is to dream not of Socialism, but of Anarchism."

This is the boasted equality under Socialism, which is proclaimed at the street corner—an equality maintained by the whips of the State officials, the masters. It is the only way in which equality could be maintained. As President Butler of Columbia University writes:[1]—

"Nature knows no such thing as equality. Destroy inequality of talent, and capacity, and life, as we know it, stops. The corner-stone of Democracy is natural inequality; its ideal the selection of the most fit. Liberty is far

[1] *True and False Democracy*, pp. 56, 57.

more precious than equality, and the two are mutually destructive."

Let us listen to Mr. H. M. Hyndman, another leader of the Social Democratic Party :[1]—

"Do not let us forget that in so far as this tends simply to State control, it may mean the control of a bureaucracy and the domination of experts. That entails with it a sort of qualified slavery. There is no more offensive prig than a bureaucrat, none more wholly impervious to reason when his conceit of himself is threatened."

Mr. H. G. Wells, another prominent State Socialist, and formerly one of the leading Fabians, writing in the *Daily Mail* of June 27, 1910, tells us that :—

"Any step towards a more collectivist organisation of society may be a step towards the control of our lives by a narrow-minded, cramping, tyrannous, and in all probability, extremely dishonest bureaucracy. It is idle to pretend that this probability has been in any way disposed of in the current Socialist literature of our time. It has not. The contemporary Socialist has still to show that such a tyranny is improbable, he has still to give

[1] *Social Democracy*, p. 21.

the world effectual guarantees that this is not necessarily a consequence of increasing public organisation. Of course, as a Socialist I think he can do so, and that we can look forward to a far more collectivist state of things than the present; but I do not think my side has stated the reason in anything like a satisfactory form. I should have no objection to my dealings with my children, or with my or anybody's way of life being 'searched out' and assisted and controlled by a highly qualified and understanding physician, or a sympathetic educationist, or any keenly understanding and honest and noble person; but suppose the searcher is some well-meaning old maid in search of an interest in life or some casual hanger-on of a political clique jobbed into a position of trust."

Mr. Wells would, therefore, have no objection to slavery, provided the slave-drivers were well-disposed and competent; his only fear is that they would more probably be ill-disposed and incompetent. Many experiments in State Socialism have been tried on a small scale, some under exceptionally favourable conditions. But they have all been tried on men accustomed to freedom; and they all broke down because these men would not submit to the slavery involved in the system. If such

an experiment as the State Socialist desires could ever be tried in this country, it must and would lead to the most terrible civil war. The leaders of the State Socialist group are quite aware that this would be the case if any attempt were made to impose such a system suddenly. They appear, however, to believe, or at any rate they say they believe, that it could be brought about gradually. The State Socialist proposes to extend the power and sphere of action of the State, not suddenly, but by slow and almost imperceptible stages. At each stage the worker will learn to lean more and more upon the State, that is to say, upon his rulers. He will gradually become a leaner, and unable to do anything but lean. By such a gradual preparation for his future state of slavery, it is anticipated that he will become fitted for slavery. In the honeyed language of the Socialist, he will have been educated up to Socialism. He will then walk contentedly into the slave-pen, and march submissively to the crack of the officials' whips. Then is to come the time of those who have laboured to introduce State Socialism. With the aid of an army of officials they will conduct the industry of the country. They will fix the payment and conditions of work for themselves

and their underlings, an army of bureaucrats comprising from a third to half of the population, all non-producers, all living upon the product of the industry of the country. This is the meaning of the Socialist promises that all the product is to go to the labourers. The labourer is no longer to have his wage as a first charge upon industry. The State officials must, of course, have the first charge. They have the whip, and if they cannot be satisfied without reducing the labourer's wages, the wages must go down. And down they must go too if the officials make blunders, and the output diminishes. The officials are the slave-drivers. They have the whip. The slaves must obey. They cannot strike. To strike work would be to starve, or to be driven to work by the whip. It would be for the officials to decide. The labourers could not change masters, for there would be no other masters. They could not emigrate, unless the officials gave them leave, or unless they succeeded in escaping, perhaps at the risk of execution, or the whip, if they were caught. That is State Socialism. Let us see what a Socialist of Class II. has to say on the subject. Mr. Robert Blatchford writes in the *Clarion* of July 29, 1910, as follows :—

"In a Socialist State, such as Mr. Wells has in mind, tyranny would be almost certain. But Mr. Wells is talking about State Socialism. If England passed into State Socialism to-morrow I should emigrate. We could not stand it. No man who understands the meaning of the words 'liberty,' 'toleration,' and 'equality' could live under State Socialism; it would be hell. I have always agreed with Artemus Ward that we are governed too much. Under State Socialism, worked by the existing democracy, we should be governed more."

Even if it could be proved to demonstration that such a system would improve the material conditions of life for the submerged and partially submerged classes, the cost would be too great for it to have any prospect of acceptance by a freedom loving nation. But State Socialists have not even any definite plans to propose. All they have to say is that things would be sure to work out satisfactorily if the experiment were tried. Listen to what Mr. Sydney Webb has to say on this matter:[1]—

"The greatest need of the English Socialist party at this moment is men and women of brains who will deliberately set themselves, by

[1] *The Basis and Policy of Socialism*, p. 58.

serious study, to work out the detailed application of collectivist principles to the actual problems of modern life. We need to do a great deal more hard thinking in almost every department of our Socialist programme. I am appalled when I realise how little attention we have yet been able to pay to what I may call the Unsettled Questions of Democratic Administration.

"To take, for instance, the pressing problem of the unemployed. In my humble judgment no plan has yet been devised by which the fluctuations of work could be entirely prevented, or safe and profitable employment found for those rendered idle by no fault of their own. It is easy enough to demand that something should be done; and I entirely agree with agitating the subject, but something more than agitation is required. It is of no use urging remedies which can be demonstrably proved to be worse for the patient than the disease itself. I fear that if we were given full power to-morrow to deal with the unemployed all over England we should find ourselves hard put to it to solve the problem."

Since State Socialism is admitted by its own advocates to involve a system of forced labour

indistinguishable from slavery, and not one of these advocates can give any reason for believing that it would even ameliorate any of the ills for which it is put forward, it stands condemned upon the evidence of its own supporters, and we may pass on to the consideration of Class II., the Communal Anarchists.

The ideal of philosophic Anarchism is a community, all the members of which live together in harmony on the simple basis of free individual development and mutual Sociality. It assumes the complete absence of the selfishness and weakness of individuals which, in all human communities, necessitate social organisation and legislation, in order to attain any approximation towards a state of harmony.

Some thinkers of considerable intellectual ability have dreamed that such conditions might be attainable in actual human society, and it is on the basis of these dreams that the ordinary rank and file of Anarchists endeavour to disorganise society and abolish all forms of government, by violent methods or otherwise. The violent methods are naturally attractive to the criminal classes and degenerates who interpret Anarchism as a system in which every one takes what he can for himself without any regard to the rights of others, a simple

reversion to savagery. The whole Anarchist philosophy of life is expressed in the phrase of the Russian Anarchist Bakunin, *neither God nor master*, who also wrote, "Patriotism is an evil, a narrow and a fatal custom." At the International Anarchist Congress at Amsterdam, in 1907, the delegate Croiset expressed the fundamental principle of Anarchism in the words, "Myself first, and then the rest;" and the delegate Nacht declared that "he should make straight for active expropriation," *expropriation* being the term employed by Anarchists as a euphemism for theft, burglary, and other forms of robbery, which may or may not be accompanied by assassination. A somewhat less unscrupulous delegate, Vorhyzek, said he wished to make the personal declaration that "he could not consider expropriation for individualist uses a clean method of life." This sentiment, however, did not meet with the approval of the delegate Goldman, who declared that "as to expropriation, this must be judged entirely according to individual cases. It would be obviously absurd to strike off a member of a group because he had been forced to steal for his own individual needs."[1]

[1] Quoted in *Anarchist Propaganda in England*, *Fortnightly Review*, February 1911.

Communal Anarchism is a system arrived at by coupling together the entirely incompatible ideals of absolutely unrestricted individualism, and the communal holding of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. The Communal Anarchists are therefore included under the accepted definition of Socialists, and many of them call themselves Socialists, although their ideal is diametrically opposed to that of the State Socialists. The anti-Socialist, standing on the firm ground of reason and experience, finds the State Socialist and the Communal Anarchist attempting to draw him in opposite directions. The true path of progress is bounded on one side by the bottomless morass of Anarchism, and on the other by the arid desert of State Socialism.

Both Anarchists and State Socialists work together in apparent harmony, and appeal to each other to preserve this superficial appearance before outsiders, and to settle their differences in private. The basis of their agreement consists in the fact that the efforts of both factions are directed to the disorganisation of society, the destruction of which is an essential preliminary to the realisation of either of the two opposed ideals. As Professor Flint writes: "It is simply comical to hear

Communism preached by revolutionaries and anarchists."[1]

Avowed Anarchism in this country is represented by a little-known monthly journal, *Freedom*. The leading organ of Communal Anarchism is the much better known weekly paper, the *Clarion*, edited by Mr. Robert Blatchford. It sails under Socialist colours, advocates State Socialism, and issues appeals for Socialist unity, because, as will presently be demonstrated, its leaders are of opinion that it is easier to extend the principles of State Socialism than those of Anarchism, and that any considerable adoption of the former would plunge the working-classes into such abject misery as to lead to civil war, which they believe will afford an opportunity for the successful propagation of Anarchism. The open propagation of Communal Anarchism is at present largely engineered from abroad and carried on by alien refugees.

The Houndsditch assassins and their associates appear to have been Communal Anarchists, for, according to the *Daily Express* of December 30, 1910, the inscription, *Lettish Anarchist Communist Group, Leesa, London*, was printed in disc form on letters which were

[1] *Socialism*, p. 41.

found in the room of the murderer who died at a house in Gold Street.

The insidious Anarchist propaganda of the *Clarion* organisation is carried on by means of its *Socialist* Sunday Schools, social entertainments and cycling clubs, and travelling vans. The *Fortnightly Review* article previously referred to, and from which I shall presently cull further quotations from Anarchist writers, gives details which show that both the *Independent* Labour Party and the Social Democratic Party extend their hospitality to the Anarchist propaganda. For example, in 1909, two Anarchist demonstrations were held in connection with the various Independent Labour Party and Social Democratic Party branches of Newcastle and Gateshead, and two addresses were delivered at Stroud under the auspices of the local branch of the Independent Labour Party. During the winter of 1909–10 Anarchist propaganda meetings were held at the Independent Labour Party Club at Walthamstow, at which Malatesta lectured, in English, on Anarchy and Anarchism. *The Times* of January 4, 1911, referred to this man as "the most able and often thought to be the most dangerous of Anarchist leaders." In June 1910 an Anarchist address and convivial

meeting was held in the *Labour Church* at Norwich.

Moreover, an Anarchist School has been established for more than a year in the Independent Labour Party Rooms, 1 Clarendon Terrace, Liverpool, at which about fifty children attend. We learn from the same article that it was founded on the basis of the "Modern Schools" established by Ferrer in Spain for teaching Anarchism. *Freedom* of November 1909 describes Ferrer as "a synthesis of Anarchy," and as a friend of all phases of Anarchist thought and action, and the style of his teaching may be inferred from his own words: "The public educator can do nothing until he is liberated from the triple restraint of religious, patriotic, and economic prejudices." Mr. R. James, whom the *Fortnightly Review* describes as closely associated with the Liverpool School, writes:[1] "What are we Anarchists doing to spread our ideas amongst the young people of tender years? I contend that this was Ferrer's principal work. . . . The mind of the child is more susceptible to change than the mind of a man, too often steeped in patriotism and religion. Gather a few lads and lasses together, and tell them

[1] *Freedom*, April 1910.

that government and gods are false and treacherous. Do it now."

The character of Malatesta's teaching may be inferred from his penny pamphlets. In *Anarchy* he describes the police as the most pernicious class of functionaries. The concluding words of another Anarchist writer in *The Pyramid of Authority* are—"Repudiate all the tyrants of to-day, high and low;" and we must remember that, to the Anarchist, tyrant stands for any one in authority. In *A Talk about Anarchist Communism* Malatesta explains the use that may be made of explosives. Prince Kropotkin, the ablest of the Anarchists, tells us, in one of his penny pamphlets,[1] that Anarchist Communism "maintains that most valuable of all conquests, individual liberty. . . . Each individual will be able to give free rein to his inclinations and his passions, without any other restraint than the love and respect of those who surround him." And again:[2] "When the great sources of moral depravity—capitalism, religion, justice, government"—are destroyed, then there will be no more hunger or want, but man will attain the "superior development of what is original

[1] *Anarchism in Socialistic Evolution.*
[2] *Anarchy: its Philosophy and Ideal.*

in him, the greatest fruitfulness of intelligence, feeling, and will."

This ideal is to be achieved by "flinging overboard Law, Religion, and Authority,"[1] and with respect to authority he tells us:[2] "With that glorious revolutionary enthusiasm which inflamed the souls of our ancestors, let them wish to stab all tyrants there and then;" let them revolt against the laws which decree that "this man who shot at a crowned murderer should be imprisoned for life." The pamphlet containing these inflammatory incitements to outrage were, as the writer in the *Fortnightly* informs us, on sale at a recent bazaar at Caxton Hall, Westminster, held by the National Society of Socialist Sunday Schools.

Mr. Blatchford, the editor of the *Clarion*, states in the article previously quoted that he and "all the *Clarion* men" are advocates of *Communal Anarchy;* and, moreover, he tells us where to find out what he means by the expression, for there are, as we have seen, many kinds of Anarchists:—

"There are two socialisms and two democracies. One kind of social democracy would be the worst form of slavery the race has

[1] *Anarchist Morality.*
[2] *An Appeal to the Young.*

known; the other kind of social democracy would be a more complete form of liberty than the race has ever dreamed of. The social democracy I have wished for, and still believe in, is the Socialism of *News from Nowhere*, and *The Sorcery Shop*."

The former was the work of the poet and Socialist, William Morris. It is a poetically written dream representing a race of beautiful and amiable human animals who are supposed to be the representatives, in some far distant future, of the human race. Their outlook is limited to purely material conditions, science, literature, philosophy, and religion having been relegated to a remote, and almost forgotten, past. But art is highly developed and widely diffused, and mutual love and kindness have attained the perfection of the most ideal Christianity, subject to the limitation of the mental and moral outlook to purely material conditions. The only suggestion that its author intended it for anything more than *Chapters from a Utopian Romance*, which is the description on the title page, is afforded by the concluding sentence :—

"Yes, surely! and if others can see it as I have seen it, then it may be called a vision rather than a dream."

The Sorcery Shop is a comparatively slight replica, by Robert Blatchford, of *News from Nowhere*, from which it differs mainly in that some place has been reserved for science, that every one is a vegetarian, and that wine, beer, and other alcoholic drinks are unknown, whereas in *News from Nowhere* the finest wines can be had for the asking. The older children also receive class instruction if they desire it; a navvy, in his dinner-hour, discusses the latest translation of the Odyssey with scholarly interest; the women are more moral; and the people have not lost all their higher humanity.

Passing on to the consideration of *News from Nowhere*, we find the supposed narrator of the story returning to his bed at Hammersmith after taking part in an Anarchist discussion, and supposing himself to awake, although in the same place, yet in a new and strange world.

Every trace of the railway systems—track, bridges, and everything—has disappeared, and with the railways have disappeared the factories and the factory towns. Commerce there is none, and the rivers and canals have once more become the main arteries for such traffic as is still requisite. London and all the manufacturing towns and business streets have been

rebuilt with houses of noble architecture standing in spacious gardens, while peaceful meadows occupy the sites of the former slums. The men are handsome, the women are fair, and their garments are beautiful and of the finest material. Even the dustman who appears upon the scene spends the long intervals between his short spells of work, partly in writing novels, and partly in taking exercise in garments of mediæval design richly embroidered with gold.

The Government of the country has shrunk to the dimensions of the town and village communes which hold their meetings in the otherwise deserted churches. The whole world has embraced Communal Anarchism, and all the nations dwell together in peaceful amity. The prisons have all been demolished, and the prisoners released. When a dispute does end in a murder, as still happens occasionally, the murderer is called upon to make a public statement of his regret at a meeting of the commune. He then becomes an object of special sympathy and attention in order to assist in allaying the pangs of remorse which it is assumed he must necessarily suffer.

No one thinks of making any inventions, though such of the old ones as can be utilised,

and which satisfy the refined artistic tastes of the people, are retained. Machine work has almost entirely given place to hand work. Book lore of all kinds is regarded with disfavour, and science, philosophy, and religion appear to have passed from human ken. The inhabitants are, indeed, no longer recognisable as human beings, except in their physical character. They are just clever and very amiable animals. Idleness and selfishness have become extinct diseases, and only interest the few who devote some of their ample leisure to the study of the ancient records. Every one loves work for its own sake, and works at what he chooses, where he chooses, and when he chooses, changing his occupation as often as he feels inclined. The whole country has become practically one vast garden, but in every district are to be found beautiful and spacious workshops, containing materials and implements for the use of every trade. When any one feels inclined for a spell of work, he may enter one of these, stay as long as he likes, do what he likes, and leave when he likes. The rougher kinds of work are much appreciated for the sake of exercise, but they have become so scarce that holiday camping parties in the forests and on the "northern wastes" are specially organised in

order to find them. There is no money and no payment. The shops are free, and any one may enter and obtain the finest wines and tobacco, the most exquisitely carved pipes, or anything else they may contain, by the simple process of asking for them. Those who are satisfied to remain in one place can take their choice between great community houses and picturesque and comfortable family dwellings, while the wants of the more restless members of the community are provided for by means of free guest-houses in every town and village.

Children are no longer sent to school. Such occupations as carpentering, cooking, thatching, paving, and road-mending are regarded by young and old as amusements, and children copy their elders in learning to play at such "games." If they feel inclined to learn to read or write they can easily obtain some friendly assistance, otherwise no one compels them to do so. Most of them, in addition to their own language, are able to speak French, German, Irish, and Welsh, which they pick up from foreign child visitors or in their own travels.

If any one be disabled from illness or old age, his friends and neighbours compete for the pleasure of giving him a home, with all the

care and attention that he may require. Superfluous children who are not wanted by their parents are provided for in a similar manner, and this is a contingency that must frequently arise. One young woman in the story gets tired of her husband after presenting him with a couple of children, and settles down with a new partner. The children find a home, and the husband remains disconsolate but resigned, not finding another partner to his liking. After a year's experience of the new husband, the woman begins to hanker after the old one. She therefore leaves No. 2 and contrives to meet No. 1 again. A new courtship begins, in which she exhibits all the coyness of the most innocent maiden, and finally makes her home with No. 1 again. Another instance of the amenities of courtship is afforded by a young woman who, after rejecting one suitor and accepting another, is so annoyed by the rejected one that the latter is at last told by the neighbours that he had better go elsewhere. He, however, prefers to make a treacherous and murderous attack upon his rival, who kills him in self-defence. The latter feels such remorse at having been compelled to slay his rival that he is preparing to end his own life, and the young woman is preparing to follow him, but the neighbours

intervene, persuade them to be more reasonable, and do their best to comfort them.

Marxian Socialism was found on examination to be based upon absurd theories. State Socialism, which relies largely upon Marx's theories, was further shown to be condemned by the admissions of its own leading supporters. The system of Communal Anarchy, which is also largely dependent on the Marxian theories, is, on the face of it, so intrinsically absurd, that it might well be described as *Silly Socialism.* The *Clarion* organisation does not, however, devote its energies to the direct promulgation of this childish nonsense. It supports the State Socialists with all its energies, in spite of the convictions of its leaders that the success of State Socialism would mean a hell for the workers. Every week its columns contain appeals for Socialist unity. The *Clarion* aim is to help the State Socialists to prepare a hell for the working classes, and to drive them into it. Yet Mr. Blatchford and his assistants are not a group of malicious "devils." They are, on the contrary, at any rate the majority of them, well-meaning, kind-hearted people, who, however, are remarkably deficient in reason. The whole wild scheme is revealed by a further reference to Morris's work in the

light of Mr. Blatchford's amazing outburst of candour, from which I have been quoting, for he writes further :—

"We have thought it probable that before a Socialist community found salvation they would have to pass through a probation of State Socialism. During such probation the Communists would be where the Socialists now are. They would be an active minority."

Morris's description of the manner in which the change was supposed to have come about shows that his opinion of State Socialism was as low as Blatchford's. For the gradual advance of State Socialism is represented as having given rise to "growing confusion, great suffering amongst the working classes, and, as a consequence, great discontent." This was followed by the breakdown of the world-wide industrial system, reducing the working classes to such a state of misery and destitution as to issue in rebellion developing into civil war. After the war had lasted for some two years, and the whole country had been devastated to an unprecedented extent, the Communists obtained the upper hand, and after a long period of unrest, evolved the state of things previously described.

It appears, therefore, that the aim of the

Clarion organisation, according to the admissions of Mr. Blatchford, its life and soul, is nothing less than, by promoting the progress of State Socialism, to reduce the workers to such an extremity of misery as to issue ultimately in rebellion and civil war. In the interest of the workers themselves, they propose to aid in driving them into this hell, as Blatchford himself designated it, in the vague hope that, in some dim future, their descendants may emerge into the fairyland of Morris's dream. The whole wild-cat scheme provides one more example, and one near home, of the lengths to which well-meaning would-be reformers may be carried by their enthusiasm when utterly bereft of reason.

The reader will naturally ask what kind of men are they who have been concerned in the hatching of such a scheme? I should judge Mr. Blatchford himself, from what I can gather from his writings, to be a man of lovable character, with wide sympathies and keen powers of observation. And he can express his thoughts in terse, forcible, and often beautiful language. He also possesses, in a wonderful degree, the faculty of persuading himself of the truth of anything that he wants to believe, however absurd it may be, even though it may

be obvious to any one possessed of ordinary reasoning powers that it is in absolute contradiction to something else which he already holds to be true. He can make himself feel absolutely certain that two contradictory statements are true, and there can be, I think, little or no doubt that it is on the basis of two absolutely incompatible views, both of which he sincerely holds, that he has persuaded himself into regarding this poetic dream of Morris as a practicable scheme of human life.

Mr. Blatchford calls himself a determinist, and is apparently an ardent disciple of Professor Haeckel in his later, unscientific stage,[1] as presented in his popular extravaganza, *The Riddle of the Universe*, a work which was dilated upon in a series of *Clarion* articles some years ago, in terms of extravagant and wholly unintelligent laudation. Mr. Blatchford sets forth his amazingly inconsequent and mutually destructive views on what he supposes determinism to mean in two books entitled *God and my Neighbour*, and *Not Guilty, a Defence of the Bottom Dog*. The concluding chapters of the latter contain elements of heart-breaking truth, expressed with heartfelt sincerity, relating to the misconceptions and failures of the methods

[1] See Chapter XI.

which have been devised for dealing with criminality, and they go far to show the lovability of the author's character. For they reveal him as simply an overgrown child, with all the inherent inconsequence of the childish mind. And in the childish mind, as in the child, there is something essentially lovable. But it is not to the childish mind that a reasonable man looks for guidance in matters where reason as well as sympathy are requisite. And the absence of reason appears on nearly every page of these volumes. They would make capital exercise books for a junior class in logic, for there is scarcely a fallacy known to logicians which they do not exemplify in abundance. Those contained in the first-mentioned volume supply most of the material for Dr. Ballard's *Clarion Fallacies*. It will be sufficient for our present purpose to indicate the most fundamental one and the manner of its introduction.

Determinism is a perfectly comprehensible philosophical position. It is simply another word for *fatalism*, and its introduction into practical life spells disaster. We shall see in Chapter VIII. that it represents man as being just as devoid of initiative power as a machine, but, unless we attribute consciousness to

machines, as savages frequently do, man differs from a machine in being conscious. His consciousness, however, according to this theory, only makes him aware of himself and his surroundings. It does not enable him, of his own initiative, to influence them. He can only influence them in the way that machines influence one another, that is to say, in obedience to action external to himself. A pair of locomotives could not, of their own initiative, either assist or damage each other. They can do either when they are made to do it, by the action of their drivers, or other persons. Mr. Blatchford tells us over and over again, in these volumes, that this is his position. But he also claims to occupy the totally incompatible position of free-will, according to which man differs from a machine, not only in possessing *awareness*, but also in possessing initiative. The advocate of free-will does not dream of maintaining that man is not influenced, and largely influenced, by his antecedents and his surroundings, in other words, by his heredity and his environment. But he maintains that these do not wholly determine his actions. His own initiative also plays a part in determining them.

It is impossible to occupy both positions.

Either a man has initiative or he has not. One or the other must be true. The initiative of man must either exist or not exist. If a man denies this it is no use attempting to convince him by argument. The law of contradiction, that a thing cannot both be and not be, is a necessary law of reason, and as Aristotle told us, more than two thousand years ago, a man who does not accept it as such can no more be influenced by argument than can a vegetable. It would be as foolish to argue with him as to argue with a cabbage. The initiative possessed by man, according to the advocate of free-will, is expressed by the action of the will. The determinist maintains that a man's will is entirely determined for him, that it has no power of initiative. The advocate of free-will maintains that a man's will is not entirely determined for him, but has a power of initiative. Mr. Blatchford takes up the determinist position when he writes :[1]—

"The word Will is a symbol, and means the balance between two motives or desires. Will is like the action of balance in a pair of scales. It is the weights in the scales that decide the balance. So it is the motives in the mind that decide the Will. When a man chooses between

[1] *God and my Neighbour*, p. 134.

two acts we may say that he 'exercises will'; but the fact is, that one motive weighs down the other, and causes the balance of the mind to lean to the weightier reason. There is no such thing as an exterior will outside the man's brain, to push one scale down with the finger. Will is abstract, not concrete."

On the following page he draws the perfectly legitimate conclusion from this assumption, and writes: "Therefore man is not responsible for the action of the Will."[1] On p. 147 he assumes the position of the advocate of free-will, and writes:—

"I believe that I am what heredity and environment made me. But I know that I can make myself better or worse, if I try. I know that because I have learnt it, and the learning has been part of my environment."

If a man can make himself better or worse, or exert any effect whatever upon himself or

[1] In *Not Guilty*, Chapter XII., p. 203, Mr. Blatchford himself illustrates the practical results of this conclusion as follows:—

"A tramp has murdered a child on the highway, has robbed her of a few coppers, and has thrown her body into a ditch.

"Do you mean to say that tramp could not help doing that? Do you mean to say that he is not to blame? Do you mean to say he is not to be punished?

"Yes, I say all these things; and if all these things are not true this book is not worth the paper it is printed on."

anything else, he must possess a power of initiative. The second sentence of the paragraph last quoted, if translated into the view of the determinist, would read, *I know that my environment can make me better or worse by its changes.* The third sentence of the last quotation shows plainly enough how Mr. Blatchford has muddled himself from one position into the other, and has therefore become an *indeterminate determinist*, a self-contradiction, in other words, an *irrationalist.* He has never formed any definite concept of the word *environment*, and employs it in two totally different senses. When he is a determinist, environment is used in the ordinary sense of the man's surroundings, excluding himself. It is so used when he states that "everything outside our skin belongs to our environment";[1] but when, on the preceding page, he includes the emotions, hope and fear, in a man's environment, he is using the term in quite a different sense, as standing for the man himself and his surroundings. It is in this latter sense that he uses the term when he writes: "The learning has been part of my environment." The process of learning may involve the man's surroundings, but it *must* involve a mental process in the man himself.

[1] *Not Guilty*, p. 88.

The term *environment* is therefore used, in this case, to represent the man *and* his surroundings. Mr. Blatchford adheres consistently throughout to the verbal statement that man is the product of heredity and environment, and nothing else. But when he claims that man can make himself better or worse, or produce any other effect upon himself or his surroundings, the term *environment* stands for the man *and* his surroundings. When, however, he makes such statements as:—

"If our heredity be good, and if our environment be good, we must act well; we cannot help it. If our heredity be bad, and if our environment be bad, we must act ill; we cannot help it." [1]

Then environment stands for the man's surroundings only, and does not include the man himself.

Mr. Blatchford stands in the free-will position when he believes that the exertions of himself and his friends can help to bring about the state of things which he wants. Otherwise, his exhortations in the *Clarion* would be as useless, and therefore as foolish, as it would be to exhort a mouse confined in a trap to go back to its nest, or to exhort a tree to transplant itself

[1] *Not Guilty*, p. 193.

from the hedge into the garden. He stands in the determinist position when he believes that, once the conditions are what he would consider right, all people will act rightly as soon as the heredity has accommodated itself to the new conditions—acting rightly, according to his view, consisting in acting so as to maintain those conditions.

Mr. Blatchford's thimble-rigging is much more easily detected than that of Karl Marx, for he is absolutely unconscious of it, and performs it without mystifying himself and his readers with complexities of involved verbiage. Consequently, many to whom Blatchford's absurdities are obvious, are quite incapable of unravelling those of Marx. Is it to be wondered at, that when challenged to meet argument, Mr. Blatchford prefers to lie still? *Blatchford logic* is unanswerable—to Blatchford. But when asked to allow his readers to compare it for themselves with *Logic*, he very wisely says, "No thank you."

Mr. Blatchford was invited to reason about a misstatement which appeared in the *Clarion* in March 1910. Mr. Blatchford went into hiding. The details were published, with a remarkable letter from the *Clarion*, and a further challenge to Mr. Blatchford, in the

preface to a pamphlet[1] which was sent to him in the following June. Mr. Blatchford remained in hiding until December 1910, when he, or his acting editor, mustered up courage to make a retort, although not a reply; for all reference to the challenge was carefully avoided, and the retort consisted of an outpouring of pitiably feeble personalities, and a so-called argument of the kind beloved by Mr. Blatchford, directed against the sixth and last of the writer's recent Manchester lectures.[2] It appeared in the *Clarion*, December 23, 1910, and is reproduced below, as affording the strongest possible corroboration of the present writer's views of the mental condition of the leaders of the *Clarion* organisation. It will also serve as an illustration of the intellectual quality and literary style of a paper which lays claim to a considerable circulation amongst Socialists in this country.

The Lie Recurrent.

"*We have scotched the snake, not killed it.*"

One must charitably conclude that Mr. G. W. de Tunzelmann, B.Sc., was gravell'd for lack

[1] Report of a debate on *Theism and the Problem of the Universe*, between G. W. de Tunzelmann and Joseph McCabe. Sherratt & Hughes. 6d.

[2] See *Modern Physics and Rational Ethics*, Lecture VI.

of matter when in Manchester the other day he burbled that very ancient and fish-like terminological inexactitude, "Socialism is Atheistic." I really thought I had assisted at the obsequies of this sorry lie — gross as a mountain, open, palpable — when Bishop Welldon, Dean of Manchester, apparently gave it its quietus some two years ago. Let me recall Dr. Welldon's words:—

"Perhaps you will allow me, as a minister of the Christian Church, to say that Christianity could not repudiate Socialism. The first Christians were Socialists, for they had all things in common."

Furthermore, the Dean, I remember, made this pronouncement: "Socialism is not property-confiscating. It does not imply any necessary violation of law, but *guards and assists the true rights of property.*" Mr. de Tunzelmann is apparently a stranger to Manchester, and unaware of Bishop Welldon's eminence, otherwise he would scarcely have had the effrontery to stand up at a public meeting and impudently assert that Christians who hold the views formulated by the Dean "can only do so through ignorance or intellectual incompetence."

But—how curious and providential it is that

Nature seems to grow the bane and the antidote together!—the de Tunzelmannian falsehood was very effectively squelched and cancelled almost at the moment it was spoken.

The Rev. A. J. Carlyle, of Oxford, preaching in St. Ann's Church, dealt with the subject of the Christian Church and Socialism, and in a striking sermon put to rout the B.Sc. who, among other polished little pleasantries, had claimed that "Socialism aims at the minimising of suffering and discontent by reducing mankind morally and intellectually to the level of pigs." Well, there are even more profound depths of degradation than the stye; and the Anti-Socialist Union appears very successfully to have fallen into them. *Facilis descensus Anti!*

But to the Rev. A. J. Carlyle's sermon. He read Mr. de Tunzelmann and persons of his kidney a neat lesson, and, incidentally, provided them with some much-needed knowledge.

Socialism, he said, was really *a very simple and a definite thing*. He was rather tired of hearing people say it was vague. *It was a proposal to substitute the collective ownership of the means of production, distribution, exchange, or what they called the capital in land, for private ownership.*

That was Socialism, that and nothing else. Even philanthropy was not Socialism; the extension of the powers of the policeman was not Socialism; the further organisation of the sanitary system of a city was not Socialism, and neither was the tightening up of legislation in regard to conditions of life in factories. That was not his statement alone, but the statement of every economist.

The opposition between religion and Socialism was an imaginary opposition. Some people would say that the Christian Church must resist an attack upon private property, but the opinion that the Church had any business to defend any particular form of private property was a pure delusion.

No. Private property must be content to hire de Tunzelmanns to defend its interests. But private property might have the sense and decency to provide its salaried myrmidons with clean weapons. The rusty, toxic, marine-store tarradiddles they fling about so irresponsibly are as barbarous and uncivilised as poisoned krisses or Chinese stink-pots. The Lie Circumstantial and the Lie Direct are burning and honourable truths compared with the Lie Putrid and the Lie Recurrent and Recreant.

H. B.

The so-called argument is thoroughly characteristic. The Dean and the misguided Socialist clergyman are treated as arguing for one and the same Socialism. The latter is referring to what is now understood by Socialism, the confiscatory Socialism considered in the lecture referred to, in which the term Socialist was expressly limited to those who fully accept the socialisation formula. The Dean, on the other hand, makes it clear that what he means by Socialism is something entirely different, probably the so-called *Christian Socialism* of Maurice and Kingsley, which is admitted by the Rev. James Adderley, in common with all honest Socialists, not to be Socialism at all, in the sense in which the term is now employed.

Having made the obviously false assumption that the two advocates whom he cites are speaking of the same thing, the writer proceeds on the further assumption that any one differing from the opinion which they are both supposed to support is a legitimate target for his illiterate vituperation. One cannot help wondering that neither Mr. Blatchford nor any member of the *Clarion* staff was possessed of the small modicum of intelligence required to perceive that each one of themselves, and of their readers, who holds either of Mr. Blatchford's dogmas—that

man is not responsible to God, or that Christianity is not true—is a butt for every one of the expletives contained in this screed. For the Dean and the clergyman denounce both.

Moreover, as we shall presently see, Mr. Blatchford has definitely and repeatedly asserted that Socialism and religion are incompatible, and has taunted the Labour Party for excluding "religion and Atheism" from their "policy."

An object lesson is also given in one of the favourite devices of the less reputable controversialist, the manipulation of quotations in such manner as to give, not the view expressed by the speaker, but the view which the controversialist is anxious to foist upon him. The *Clarion* writer carefully abstains from quoting John Stuart Mill's well-known observation, "I would rather be a discontented man than a contented pig," but quotes the comment upon it as an independent statement, with the obvious intention of making it appear offensive.

The argument developed in the lecture was of course studiously ignored, for the simple reason that no one on the *Clarion* staff was capable of dealing with it. The misrepresentation of presenting argued conclusions as though they were mere assertions was therefore the

only way in which the matter could be treated without exposing the ineptitude of the staff to the readers of the paper in a manner even more complete than in the effusion which we are considering.

The assumption that reasoned argument can be met by the expression of adverse opinion, falsely attributed to the Dean, and correctly to Mr. Carlyle, or, for that matter, by the mere opinion of any man, however eminent, is characteristic of the depth of superstition in which the writers and most of the readers of the *Clarion* are engulfed.

The conditions to be met by any one, Socialist or not, who desires to controvert the reasoned arguments by which it has been proved that Atheism is inherent in Socialism, and not merely associated with it accidentally, are clearly indicated on p. 145, where the author has definitely accepted the Rev. James Adderley's challenge, and referred him to the complete answer to it in Chapter X.

It is an imperative duty, however repugnant it may be to one's feelings, to expose the baseless pretensions of incompetence posing in the garb of wisdom and authority, and misleading those who have not the requisite knowledge and training to judge for themselves.

The fulfilment of this unpleasant duty need not, and should not, however, lead to any unnecessary harshness of expression, or personal feeling of hostility towards men whose intentions may be perfectly honest, and who are themselves deceived and misled every whit as much as their dupes.

It is very natural that Mr. Blatchford should fall into the error of regarding Professor Haeckel, and less competent exponents of popular science, as reliable authorities. The list of writers contained in *God and my Neighbour* consists of an extraordinary mixture of men who know what they are writing about, and men who possess merely the faculty of writing in a popular style upon subjects of which their knowledge is very inadequate. Mr. Blatchford is not to be blamed for his incapacity to distinguish between those of his instructors who are competent and those who are not; neither is he to be blamed for the imperfection of his reasoning powers. He would, however, be far more likely to improve in both respects if he would remember that the indiscriminating admiration of his associates, above whom he has raised himself by his own ability and industry, while it may be pleasing to him, is otherwise of very little

account. He is very much in the state of the young university student who has beaten all his fellow-students in college competitions, and is looked up to by them accordingly. As soon, however, as such a student comes under the personal influence of the more highly trained and better informed minds of his professors, he begins to learn to appraise himself more justly than would have been possible if he had merely continued to bask in the pleasant but enervating sunshine of his schoolmates' unmeasured appreciation.

The whole *Clarion* staff must form a very happy family, consisting, as it does, of a little mutual admiration society of a type which would hardly be conceivable to any one who had not read their articles upon one another. Blatchford shovels the butter of flattery upon each one in turn, while they smother him with barrow-loads of it. This may account for his extravagant self-laudation, which is well exemplified in the following extract from a recent article in the opening number of a new monthly magazine in which he has been allowed to write himself a testimonial :—

"I have read a very great deal of what has been written or spoken against the things I believe. I have answered every argument that

seemed worth answering. . . . I have never met an argument that I could not answer. . . . I am a man possessed of much essential knowledge. I am a man deeply and widely read. I have a clear and logical mind."

Such a testimonial given by a man to himself can hardly fail to recall to memory the lines—

> "Whoever dares these words deface,
> Shall meet Bombastes face to face."

Like his prototype in fiction, boastful little Robert hastily retires when an antagonist quietly passes the sponge over his words, and awaits the fulfilment of his threat, which his antagonist regards in the light of a promise—a promise, however, destined to remain unfulfilled. Can it be that Robert's youthful environment, when the argument was perhaps usually a slipper, has engendered in him the fixed idea that the only appropriate posture to be adopted in relation to an argument is to turn his face away from it—to run, if possible, before being brought in contact with it, and if this be impossible, to run as soon as he can, without venturing to cast even a glance in the direction of the argument?

From a psychological point of view, Robert's testimonial to himself is interesting. He lays claim to the possession of a clear and logical

mind, when clarity and logic are the very features in which his mind is most deficient. He possesses keen powers of sympathy and observation, together with an admirable ability of expression, in the clearest and simplest language, on matters which do not require either a systematic mental training or the exercise of the critical faculty, and which are within his comprehension. As is so often the case, he thinks himself strongest just where he is weakest, and apparently fails to recognise his really strong points, or passes them over as of little or no account.

Mr. Thompson, like his chief, is kind. I am sure he must be, for he writes so nicely about dogs. He helps Mr. Blatchford to lie still. When a stupid but useful blunder finds its way into the *Clarion*, and a correction is sent, he sends the correction to the poor man who made the blunder, perhaps to teach him wisdom, perhaps not, but at any rate it is kept out of the way of the *Clarion* readers.[1] He also writes moving appeals that even opponents should help to maintain the *Clarion* —for it is so honest. He may be very wise, but, if so, he keeps it very quiet.

[1] See *Report of a Debate on Theism and the Problem of the Universe*, Preface, p. xviii.

Even as the proof sheets of this chapter are passing through the press, I find confirmation of Mr. Thompson's kindness of heart in the following extract from an article by him in the *Clarion* of February 10, 1911 :—

"We are quite positive that the point of view of the people is changing, that altruism is steadily gaining ground over greed and selfishness, that we are gradually learning to pay less deference to success and wealth and more respect to character and usefulness. Men are beginning to be judged, not by what they have acquired for their own betterment, but by what they have done to make the world better. The thinkers in all countries are realising and teaching that the happiness of the mass is more important to nations and to the world than the advantage of individuals. Everywhere and all the time the 'decent' people are being converted to the new gospel that weakness in a fellow creature is not a cause to exploit and oppress him, but to help him. This is what *we* mean when we proclaim the advance of Socialism."

If this were all that Socialism stands for, every social reformer, nay, every "decent" man would be a Socialist. It illustrates the truth of the remarks on p. 183 : "Socialists are often good-hearted and well-meaning men. But Socialists

are not wise and far-sighted. They are often benevolent although not beneficent, for they lack the reasoning faculty. And it is primarily by means of that faculty that men translate benevolence into beneficence, the mere desire of good results into their accomplishment."

Mr. Grayson is young, and enthusiastic, and honest. When anti-Socialist logic proved too hard for his chief, Grayson came to the rescue. He did not argue. First he was scornful; then he cried, "Oh, it hurts;" and finally he wept bitterly. If he had been wise, he would have torn up his article and written another. He would have wept all the time, when he found that scorn all the time was too great a task for him.

Mr. Suthers has written a book.[1] Let us see if we can cull from it some words of wisdom. "Do you know what the average wages of the *best paid* workers are? Forty-eight pounds a year" (p. 12). That is to say, 18s. 6d. a week. The italics are the author's. Who are the Simple Simons to whom such nonsense is addressed? "The person who gets the biggest rewards is the idle landlord or capitalist, who never produces *anything*" (p. 15). Again the italics are the author's.

[1] *Common Objections to Socialism Answered.*

"We pay some 360 millions a year in interest, and for *that* huge chunk out of the national cake *no work is done at all* by those who receive it" (p. 17). Here also the italics are the author's. If he will read Chapter III. he may learn a little sense. "Before any free-born Briton can work, he must obtain the permission of an employer, and for that permission he must pay interest and dividend" (p. 70). Mr. Suthers might have revealed the name of the employer whom he paid for permission to write his book. "In 1495 an artisan earned nearly a bushel of wheat by a day's labour. . . . There was not much machinery then, was there? Does an artisan earn a bushel of wheat, or its equivalent, in one day *now?*" (p. 23). The italics are again the author's. He evidently thought the answer was—*No, he earns less.* But the answer is —*Yes, he earns more.* For the price of the *very* best English wheat at present is 4s. 1½d. per bushel, and he must be a poor artisan, that is to say, skilled workman, or mechanic, who does not earn more than 4s. a day. And wheat was cheaper in 1495 than for many years before and after.

The selection of that year, however, cannot be credited to Mr. Suthers's sagacity. It is

the stock example of Socialists, who, moreover, omit to point out, just as Mr. Suthers does, that the real rise of wages is very much greater than the comparison of earnings in terms of wheat would indicate. In 1495 an artisan's wages were about three shillings a week, and wheat cost sixpence a bushel. But even if it were the case that a skilled workman now earns only four shillings a day, or twenty-four shillings a week, although he could not, in that case, buy more wheat now than then with his week's wages, he could buy many other things which were not then available. Some of these, such as tea, tobacco, coffee, cocoa, &c., were not available to any one, as they had not been introduced, and nearly all other foodstuffs have fallen greatly in value compared with wheat. In those days the artisan's staple foodstuffs consisted of wheat, oatmeal, and malt only.

With these examples of Mr. Suthers's wisdom before us, we are not surprised to find him declaring (pp. 106–7) that "Socialism . . . can no more be described in detail than any other thing that is hidden in the womb of time. To ask for details is a mark of ignorance. . . . It would be a silly waste of time for any Socialist to spend his life in drawing up cut-and-dried plans of a distant future."

This deliverance may be compared with the far more sensible statement of Mr. Sydney Webb on p. 99. But then Mr. Webb is a man of very different mental calibre.

Yet Mr. Suthers, like Mr. Blatchford, can write sanely and forcibly when his mind is not obsessed with fallacious theories, and his recent retirement from the *Clarion* staff is a real loss to the paper.

Mr. Lowerison seems to have taken his place; and from Mr. Suthers to Mr. Lowerison is a great descent. This gentleman has been studying some excellent popular manuals of astronomy with a view of passing on the knowledge acquired thereby to the readers of the *Clarion*. His first attempt to do so, in the isssue of February 10, 1911, is not promising, for it is mainly devoted to cheap sneers at a religion of which he has no glimmer of understanding. If he would carefully study, and attempt to digest, Professor Max Müller's three courses of Gifford Lectures, *Physical Religion*, *Anthropological Religion*, and *Psychological Religion*, he would probably find his present narrow outlook very considerably extended, and I would especially commend to his notice the following sentences, which are to be found on p. 17 of the second course :—

"*True thinking* means free thinking, thinking following its own laws, and unswayed by anything else. Think what thinking would be if it were not free! But even this would not suffice. There ought to be not only loyal submission to the laws of thought, there ought to be a *sincere love*, a deep-felt yearning for truth. And lastly, that love should not manifest itself in impatient and fanatical outbursts, but in *earnest inquiry*, in patient study, in long-continued research."

This expresses the scientific attitude briefly and clearly, and if Mr Lowerison and other *Clarion* writers would only lay it to heart, it would do much to free them from the trammels of superstition within which they are, at present, so closely bound. Mr. Lowerison's more rational admirers would, moreover, no longer be compelled to write, with evident regret:[1] "I confess, however, that Harry Lowerison's extraordinary dogmatism on this very complex question [Life after Life] is somewhat trying to the patience. His reasoning, too, is positively awful."

These are the would-be leaders of British workers. The decrease of the *Clarion* circulation is explained. Bold and reiterated

[1] The *Clarion*, February 3, 1911.

assertion may be successful for a time, but when it is only the skin of a bubble with nothing but gas within, the bubble is pricked one day, and behold nothing tangible remains.

Nebulous Socialism need not occupy us for long. It includes most of the few Christian Socialists who accept the socialisation formula. They may be divided into two groups: those who understand the meaning of the formula and those who don't. The former are Socialists who think they are Christians. The latter think they are Socialists, and are, many of them, Christians. The most noteworthy of the latter class is that earnest Christian worker and transparently honest man, the Rev. James Adderley. He has written a pamphlet with the title, *Is Socialism Atheism?* It contains an able and thoroughly straightforward defence of the contention that it is not. On p. 4 he writes:—

"The Anti-Socialist, then, if he calls us Atheists, must be able to show that our proposals tend to the elimination of God from men's minds. Further than this he must show that there is something essentially Godless about them. It is not enough to show that many Socialists are Atheists in religion; he must show that in the proposals themselves, whatever our professed religion

may be, there is an atheistic principle. I do not think he can show this. I think he can only show, what nobody doubts, that Socialism has been, and is largely, in the hands of people who call themselves Atheists, but this is a very different thing from showing that Socialism is Atheism."

This is, in my opinion, a perfectly reasonable claim. In the first place, an anti-Socialist, or any one else, who would assert that all Socialists are Atheists, would merely show that he was an extremely foolish and ignorant person. I have never met any such persons, and doubt very much that any such people exist. I am prepared to go much further with Mr. Adderley. He will not dispute the fact that the intellectual leaders of Socialism are almost unanimous in their belief, not only that Atheism is a powerful ally of Socialism, but that the success of Socialism would inevitably lead to universal, or almost universal, Atheism. This fact undoubtedly tends to impress the mind of the anti-Socialist with something more than a suspicion that the belief cannot be a groundless one. But although it may excuse the acceptance by the anti-Socialist of the estimate of Socialism presented by its intellectual leaders, it does not, in my opinion,

justify the anti-Socialist in maintaining that Socialism essentially involves Atheism. In order to justify such a position he must be prepared to reply to Mr. Adderley's challenge. I accept the challenge, and refer Mr. Adderley to Chapter X. of this volume. It is not there proved for the first time. It was proved by Dr. S. S. Laurie, some twenty-six years ago, and I have expressed the conclusion in his words because I could not improve upon them. The argument of Chapter X. is developed from the basis of the argument outlined in Chapter IX., and which I have fully developed in my *Treatise on Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe*, that the human mind is a finitisation of the Universal Mind. I was not aware, until after this work was in print, that Dr. Laurie had arrived at the same conclusion by a very different path. In order to disprove my contention, Mr. Adderley must show that both Dr. Laurie's and my own lines of argument are fallacious, and I invite him either to do this or to admit the conclusion that "an organised and consistent collectivism would, like an absolute paternal despotism, be the grave of distinctive humanity"; that it would "cut off at the fountain-head the spring of the entire spiritual life of man." If that does

not involve Atheism, then words have no meaning.

The author was therefore fully justified in the conclusion which so greatly excited the ire of the *Clarion*. "Christians who accept this [the socialisation] formula can only do so through ignorance or intellectual incompetence, and are unconsciously exerting whatever influence they may unfortunately possess in the support of leaders who are consciously aiming at the destruction of Christianity and the utter degradation of humanity. Christian ministers who proclaim themselves Socialists simply become decoys through whom members of their flocks are induced to join the camp of the most active opponents of religion in every shape and form. They are unconscious traitors to the faith they profess.[1]

In order to convince every reader that the latter portion of the paragraph, which was not quoted in the *Clarion*, is as fully justified as the fundamental conclusion, it will be sufficient to consider briefly the attitude to Christianity of the Socialist organisations in this country and elsewhere.

I will take first the Socialist Party of Great

[1] From the report in the *Manchester Weekly Chronicle* November 17, 1910.

Britain, since, although insignificant in numbers, they accept Marx absolutely as their oracle, including the expression of Militant Atheism quoted in Chapter VII. They have recently published a penny pamphlet in support of this atheistic position as essential to what they call "Scientific Socialism." In June 1910 the author, representing the anti-Socialist Union of Great Britain, met their leading representative in a debate on the Marxian system to which they had challenged the Union, and in the preliminary arrangements it was agreed on their part, without any suggestion on the part of the author, that Materialism, Atheism, and Free Love, as well as Marx's economics, would be accepted by them as essential constituents of the system, and maintained by their representative.

The Social Democratic Party are also Marxian Socialists, although they allow themselves some freedom in the interpretation of his theories. Their attitude to religion is that of their apostle, and is expressed by one of the more intellectual of their leaders, Mr. Belfort Bax, who writes, in his *Essays in Socialism:* "The saying of Tridon, subsequently repeated by Bebel [the leader of the German Social Democratic Party] and others, to the effect that

Socialism stands for a system of life and thought expressing itself in economics as communism, in politics as republicanism, and in religion as atheism, embodies in a few words a large measure of truth." He adds, however, a remarkably cynical qualification: "It may be convenient for Socialists with a view to election expediency to seek to confine the definition of Socialism to the economic issue, abstracted from all the other issues of life and conduct."

A somewhat similar sentiment has been expressed by the leading German Socialist journal, *Vorwärts:* "We must guard against compromising ourselves before the people by declaring what we really wish: this would be a want of tactics." [1]

This attitude of political expediency has been adopted by *Justice*, the weekly organ of the Social Democratic Party in this country, which is now discouraging any direct attacks by Socialists upon religion in its columns. Nevertheless, anti-religious books and pamphlets by non-Socialists which come to it for review are dealt with appreciatively, while those which afford support to the other side, if acknowledged at all, are not further noticed. Moreover, the

[1] Quoted in "Anarchist Propaganda in England," *Fortnightly Review*, February 1910.

editor, Mr. Harry Quelch, speaking at Nottingham in October 1907, was reported as follows: "Whatever might be said on the question, it seemed to him that Christianity and Socialism were absolutely incompatible."[1]

It will be instructive to compare the previously quoted expression of political expediency in *Vorwärts* with the following paragraphs from the *Sozial Demokrat* of May 25, 1880:[2]—

"*As a matter of simple fact, it must be candidly avowed, Christianity is the bitterest foe of Social Democracy.* Just as so utterly dunderheaded a religion as Christianity could only strike root at all two thousand years ago in a humanity that had completely degenerated, so ever since, its efforts have always been directed, not, as one might suppose, to rid the world of misery and destitution, but rather to use them for its ends, and as a cloak for its other vices and enormities.

"When God is driven out of the brains of men, the whole privilege by the grace of God

[1] *Nottingham Daily Express*, October 24, 1907. The author is indebted for this quotation, and for several of those which follow, to that excellent and very inexpensive book, *The Case against Socialism.*

[2] Translated by the Rev. E. M. Geldart from "L'Internationale Rouge," by Dr. Zacker, and reproduced in *The Case against Socialism.*

comes to the ground, and when heaven hereafter is recognised as a big lie, men will attempt to establish heaven here. Therefore whatever assails Christianity assails, at the same time, monarchy and capitalism."

The French Socialist leader, M. Gabriel Deville, ascribed the source of the religious sentiment to the misery that grows out of capitalism, and claimed that "the emancipation of thought is thus linked to the emancipation of labour. . . . The terrestrial despot, the capitalist, will drag down in his fall the heavenly monster of imagination. . . . The belief in a Supreme Being, sovereign dispenser of happiness and suffering, will universally disappear."

Le Petit Catéchisme du Libre-Penseur, extensively used in French elementary schools under Socialist control, contains the following question and its answer. The grotesque imbecility of the latter would be laughable were not the risible faculty overpowered by one's sense of indignation at such pernicious folly being instilled into the minds of children.

Question—"Do you believe in a Supreme Being? Answer—I only believe what my reason permits me to believe, and my reason refuses to admit the principle of the 'Government

of Nature' by any being whatsoever. I am persuaded that Nature always has been, is, and always will be, republican, and consequently fitted to govern herself."[1]

In the columns of the *Labour Leader*, the official organ of the Independent Labour Party, one finds even less evidence of hostility to religion than in those of *Justice*, and the inquirer satisfied with superficially skimming the surface might believe that here at last was to be found a group of Socialists who did not regard attacks on religion as an essential portion of their propaganda. Unfortunately, a very little further investigation shows the apparent oasis to be nothing but a mirage, and reveals the fact that the Independent Labour Party is actually content to become a dumping-ground for obscene refuse which is too malodorous even for the nostrils of the Social Democratic Party. The author has a pamphlet before him as he is writing this page. He refrains from mentioning the name either of the pamphlet or its writer, as he has no desire to minister to the diseased craving for notoriety of a moral degenerate of a pitiably debased type. Its subject is the person of the Founder

[1] Translated and reproduced in *The Great Enigma*, by W. S. Lilly.

of Christianity. The contents of the pamphlet, apart from its obscenity, would attract no attention, for the feeble and illiterate composition is of the kind which the student of mental disease is only too familiar with in certain classes of habitual criminals and other "anti-social varieties of the human kind," to use Dr. Maudsley's expression, who are of "distinctly weak intellect, albeit not sufficiently so to warrant their seclusion in asylums as idiots or imbeciles." [1]

The extreme obscenity which makes such a production attractive to minds of similar generic type to its writer's shows that, in the case of the unfortunate writer of this garbage, the moral degeneration which is a not infrequent accompaniment of such mental conditions, has attained such an unusually advanced stage that the mind has practically become a moral cesspit, the moral counterpart of the mental state in which the degenerate will devour the most repulsive filth with avidity.

On the last page of the pamphlet is a statement that it is published by the Freethought Socialist League, with an address at a provincial town, and the name of an individual

[1] The Moral Sense and Will in Criminals. Maudsley's *Body and Will*, p. 276.

stated to be the honorary secretary of this body, which may or may not have a real existence. The committee of this precious league invites "capable writers" to submit manuscripts to it (or is it to him?) for publication.

Another individual (unless the different name be merely another alias) informs the reader that he has been expelled from the Social Democratic Party for selling this pamphlet, and offers inducements to those who will sell it at Socialist demonstrations. Inside the back cover the second name is advertised, from the same address as that to which "capable writers" are invited to confide their manuscripts, as a tailor who will present a pair of boots with each suit ordered (*and paid for* in advance). The tailor is also stated to be the printer. On the outside back cover the League offers to supply a list of anti-religious pamphlets and others. The titles of some of these suggest what used to be known as *Holywell Street Literature*. Two of them are advertised with the additional incentive of having been *prosecuted!* A large parcel of "mixed pamphlets and foreign publications" is also offered post-free for half-a-crown, a further suggestion of Holywell Street.

The sting of this history is in its tail. The writer of the pamphlet has been installed as Honorary Secretary of the Leeds Independent Labour Party. According to *Liberty* of May 1910, he was then occupying the position, and was advertised in the *Labour Leader* to take the chair at a meeting on the first of May at the Coliseum, Leeds, at which Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., was to be the principal speaker. According to the *Fortnightly Review*, he was still occupying it when the February number (1911) was issued. The poor demented creature who writes such garbage is a legitimate object of pity, but if the Independent Labour Party are satisfied with a local honorary secretary of this type, their opinion of themselves must be lower than that of their worst enemies. Not very many years ago the writer and the seller of such a pamphlet would have been whipped at the cart's tail. No one of modern enlightenment would desire to see such treatment meted out to so unfortunate a creature as the writer, but many would like to see it applied to the exploiter for profit of such repulsive human infirmity.

It is shown in *The Case against Socialism*, p. 346, that the resolution of the Independent Labour Party in October 1907 to dissociate

themselves, as a party, from attacks on religion, was in consequence of the exposure by the anti-Socialists of the anti-religious and atheistic propaganda carried on by them at the Parliamentary by-election in the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool in September of that year.

The following extracts from Mr. Blatchford's article in the *Clarion* of October 4, 1907, reproduced in *The Case against Socialism*, are most instructive :—

"I took my own course years ago. Believing that the Christian religion was untrue, and believing that all supernatural religions were inimical to human progress, *and foreseeing that a conflict between Socialism and religion* (so-called) *was inevitable*, I attacked the Christian religion. . . .

"But upon this last—the religious question—to hedge will be to court defeat. Upon this question the Socialists and the Labourists will be compelled to make a plain pronouncement.

"My way is to hoist the *Jolly Roger*[1] and fire a broadside. But the Labour Party cannot

[1] The simile of the *Jolly Roger* is a better one than Mr. Blatchford probably intended. The pirate only attacks the defenceless merchantman. To the battleship he shows a clean pair of heels. Could a better illustration be found of Mr. Blatchford's cowardly tactics in controversy?

adopt my way, because, upon the subject of religion, they are not unanimous.

"So the only policy that seems open to them is to repudiate me, and to declare that religion and Atheism are no more parts of the Labour policy than they are parts of the Liberal and Tory policy.

"And I don't believe that such a declaration will save them.

"So now the sagacious ones will declare that I have done great harm to the movement, and have put back the cause for many years.

"Well. Perhaps that is true. But it had to be done, and it will have to be finished. No half-and-half measures will serve. . . . *The Labour men who will not attack the so-called religions* because they are Christians are in the same position as the workers who will not join the Socialist Party because they are Radicals. They *will have to be converted.*

"No. In the matter of religion the Labour Party is between the devil and the deep sea. They cannot hoist the Christian standard, for a great many of them are not Christians; they cannot hoist the Agnostic standard, because a great many of them *are* Christians. They cannot wipe me out and bury the whole

question, for I decline to be wiped out, and their political enemies will forbid the funeral."

In *God and my Neighbour*, p. 190, we find:

"I have been asked why I have 'gone out of my way to attack religion,' why I do not 'confine myself to my own sphere, and work for Socialism, and what good I expect to do by pulling down without building up.' In reply I beg to say:

1. "That I have not 'gone out of my way' to attack religion. It was because I found religion in my way that I attacked it.

2. "That I am working for Socialism when I attack a religion which is hindering Socialism."

When these statements are compared with those expressed in the *Clarion* retort to the author's challenge to Mr. Blatchford, it will be clear that the attitude of Mr. Blatchford and the *Clarion* on this question is that of Mr. Facing-both-ways. And either face is put forward as may be most expedient at the moment. There can, however, be no doubt in the mind of any regular reader of the *Clarion* that it is intensely anti-religious in the widest sense, as well as specifically anti-Christian. The exhibition of the other face is extremely rare. But its appearance at all

is especially noteworthy in view of the claim which Mr. Thompson has the hardihood to make, that the *Clarion* is honest.

It is unquestionable that the position of the Anarchist Party, whether of the Communal variety or not, is essentially atheistic, and the author has now proved to demonstration, from Mr. Blatchford's own words, that whether he be directly preaching irreligion and Atheism, and taunting the Independent Labour Party for its refusal to adopt these principles as their avowed platform, or whether, for purposes of temporary expediency, he be advocating the opposite position, personally or through the *Clarion's* staff, he is always working steadily, to the best of his ability, for the promotion of the twin superstitions, Atheism and Anarchism.

The Independent Labour Party includes, I believe, some who would call themselves Christian Socialists, but it certainly includes many other kinds—State Socialists, Radical Socialists, Socialist Radicals, and Radicals who are not Socialists. With the exception of the State Socialists, they would all, or nearly all, come under the designation of Nebulous Socialists, so that the Independent Labour Party may be considered, with the exception of these, as standing for Nebulous Socialism. The

intellectuality of its leaders varies over a very wide range; from the more than respectable ability of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald to the childish petulance and general irresponsibility of Mr. Keir Hardie. It has the advantage, just at present, of being completely united in one definite aim upon which the attention of every one of its members is concentrated. This advantage is, however, somewhat discounted by the hopeless unattainability of the object of such united and strenuous effort. For this object is nothing less than to obtain a reversal of the famous Osborne judgment which has made it impossible for its members to satisfy any longer the requirements of existence, parliamentary and domestic, by means of compulsory contributions from trade-unionists who are politically opposed to them. One would expect them to be satisfied with the contributions of their admirers. But they are evidently reduced to desperation, and under these circumstances, no project is too foolish to be entertained. As to the reasons for this desperation, I cannot do better than cite the following extract from a signed article which appeared in *Justice*, October 1, 1910:—

"The leaders of the Labour Party have recently instituted a 'sixpenny' voluntary fund

for the maintenance of the Labour members, but the result, so far, is meagre in the extreme. One Northumberland miners' lodge of importance has subscribed two sixpences! The Labour Party, as at present constituted, is chronically and hopelessly sick — sick unto death. And the reasons are not far to seek. Members of this Labour Party, instead of concentrating their energies upon such supreme Labour questions as that of unemployment with a view to legislative measures of immediate practicability—instead of working duly and truly for the class they went to Westminster to represent—they have preferred other, and apparently more congenial, not to say profitable, avenues for their activity. While in the recent protracted spell of trade depression employed workers had their wages cut down, while the unemployed workers starved or committed suicide, while the cost of food went up, and while more and more taxes were being wrung out of the poor, Labour members went globe-trotting for months together, and when they were at home spent their time writing books about India and political economy, hobnobbing with middle-class Suffragettes of questionable manners and doubtful sanity, bolstering up the very Liberal Party they were

sent to Parliament to oppose, backing a great fraud Budget which hit the workers with special severity, and supporting the working-man's biggest traducers and vilifiers—the teetotalers. Then, to crown these sins, the Labour members have actually put themselves to special trouble to explain to the world how much better off the British workman is than the German, with the result that when our trade unionists seek advances of wages their employers can quote the alleged low wages of Germany, and the already high wages of this country, as an excuse for refusing the men's applications—an excuse backed by the special reports of the paid representatives of British labour!

"The Labour members have wasted their time. They have sacrificed their principles, gone back upon their promises, and cruelly and callously betrayed their supporters. And they are found out. The men in the workshops and pits—the trade unionists who have been financing the Labour Party—are tired of paying the piper while Liberal humbugs, temperance ranters, and Suffragette screechers call the tune."

Many extracts from Socialist papers expressing very similar views might be given, but two

more examples will suffice, the first from a leading article in the *Socialist Standard*, September 1910, and the second from one in the *Clarion* of October 14, 1910.

(1) "There is much fluttering in the pigeon-roosts of 'Labour.' The Osborne judgment, and the dozen or so of injunctions forbidding the use of Trade Union funds for political purposes, look very much like ending the all too long career of Keir Hardie's fledgling, and at the same time spoiling the political chances of many of our Labour mis-leaders, actual and potential.

"The organ of the I.L.P. waxes truculent over this 'insidious' attack, in telling of how the wicked Tories are bludgeoning and bullying the innocent trade unionist, and how the Liberals refuse to help the poor victim; and of the militant methods (whatever that may mean) the Party will be compelled to have recourse to. A deadly blow has been aimed at Labour, say they. But have not the 'Labour' crowd boasted of the one and three-quarter millions of trade unionists who have united with the Socialists (*sic*) to march solidly forward to win —'fair representation' and other dainties? Why the rumpus, then? If the boast be well-founded, surely no such paltry incidents as these

injunctions could separate these brave companions in arms—could prevent them from providing the election expenses and maintenance of their representatives.

"But no; it seems that with legal restraint on the union machine's power to stop a member's benefit, to expel him, and even to hinder him from working at his trade, there goes by the board at the same time the very basis of the so-called Labour Party. So the Party, then, depended for its existence upon the terrorising of trade unionists! Such seems a fair deduction from the insistence of the Party leaders that the unions have the power to compulsorily levy their members for political purposes. Of course, the leaders tell us that their whole concern is for the natural right of the unions, or rather the voting majority, to use the funds for such purposes. They are for 'liberty' and 'Labour's rights.' Yes, but they don't fool all of us!"

(2) "Meanwhile, the Labour Party is a miscellaneous bundle of mixed politicians. It will go to the country, if it can afford it, with nothing more stimulating than the cry, 'Give us our pay.'"

The *State Socialists* are quite as intent upon effecting the disorganisation of all industry as

the *Silly Socialists*, and the members of these two groups co-operate harmoniously in working to this end. They are actively concerned in fomenting the industrial unrest which is causing so much suffering amongst the working-classes in our own country at the present time. They are callously indifferent to all this misery, for which they are already very largely responsible, because they believe that it will bring about the conditions which they desire. The only difference between the two groups, in this respect, is that, while both believe that such disorganisation will bring about the establishment of State Socialism, this condition is regarded by the former group as a future paradise; it is regarded by the latter as a future hell, but one which forms a necessary stage on the road to a paradise of a totally different character. They blithely co-operate in preparing this hell for the workers of the present time, their children, and their grandchildren, in the confident expectation that, through their misery, their remote descendants will, in the dim and distant future, ultimately emerge into the paradise of their reason-bereft imagination.

Mr. Belfort Bax, the State Socialist, and "Philosopher of British Socialism," as he is alleed by his admirers, writes:—

"The foreign policy of the great international Socialist Party must be to break up these hideous monopolies called empires, beginning in each case at home. Hence everything which makes for the disruption and disintegration of the empire to which he belongs must be welcomed by the Socialist as an ally. It is his duty to urge on any movement tending in any way to dislocate the commercial relations of the world, knowing that every shock the modern complex commercial system suffers weakens it and brings its destruction nearer." [1]

The reader may now obtain a glimpse of the meaning which underlay the wild frothing of Keir Hardie to the Egyptian so-called Nationalists, and his still wilder antics in India, which, while bringing upon him the calm contempt of the higher classes of that country, earned for him a sort of half-pitying veneration from the villagers as one of the *afflicted of God*, this being their invariable attitude to manifestations of mental aberration.

Mr. Belfort Bax does not hesitate to maintain that it is the duty of every Socialist to place his Socialistic ideals before patriotism, and even to be prepared to become a traitor to his country,

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, p. 126.

if by so doing he may expect to further these ideals, for he writes :—

"Supposing Social Democracy triumphant in Germany before other Western countries were ripe for the change of their own initiative. It might then be a matter of life and death for Socialist Germany to forestall a military and economic isolation in the face of a reactionary European coalition by immediate action, especially against the stronghold of modern commercialism. Should such an invasion of the country take place, it would be the duty of every Socialist to do all in his power to assist the invaders to crush the will of the count-of-heads majority of the people of England, knowing that the real welfare of the latter lay therein, little as they might suspect it."[1]

I have heard an English Socialist, a foreman in an English factory, publicly and unblushingly state that he would act upon this advice should the occasion ever present itself.

[1] *The Ethics of Socialism*, p. 128.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL PROGRESS BY THE WAY OF REASON AND EXPERIENCE

We shall see in Chapter X. that the necessity of laws for the regulation of a community arose from selfishness and weakness on the part of individuals. It is the existence of these defects in human nature which makes all the schemes proposed by Anarchists utterly impracticable. The Communal Anarchist believes that the introduction of Communism would remove all such obstacles. A little observation would show him that, even in the nursery, harmony is far more easily attained when each child has its own toys than when the toys are common property, and the experience of the ages teaches the same lesson, that Communism increases friction instead of removing it. It is now more than two thousand years since Aristotle wrote on the question of a community of property :[1]—

[1] *Politics*, ii. 5 (Jowett's translation).

"Such legislation may have a specious appearance of benevolence; men readily listen to it, and are easily induced to believe that in some wonderful manner everybody will become everybody's friend, especially when some one is heard denouncing the evils now existing in States, suits about contracts, convictions for perjury, flatteries of rich men, and the like, which are said to arise out of the possession of private property. These evils, however, are due to a very different cause—the wickedness of human nature. . . . Again, we ought to reckon not only the evils which the citizens will be saved, but also the advantages which they will lose."

It was the lesser folly of State Socialism to which Aristotle referred, and not the utter imbecility of Communal Anarchism; but the problem of the internal regulation of the community was essentially identical with the problem as it presents itself to us to-day. The fundamental question is now, as it has ever been, how may the weak be most effectively protected from selfish aggression on the part of the strong? And this question may itself be merged in the still wider one, how may we most closely approximate to the condition of Justice or Harmony, the ideal condition of

true Social Progress? We shall presently consider practical details, but the derivation of general guiding principles is always facilitated by first expressing the problem in the most general form that is possible.

It is immediately evident that there are three distinct, but mutually supplementary, methods which may be employed for the attainment of the end in view. The promotion of free *Social Co-operation* or *Sociality; Voluntary Organisation; Legislation.* These methods are by no means independent—they are indeed very closely related; and yet there is a distinct step from each one to the next, each step being marked by an increased restriction in freedom. Each step is therefore a step downwards, so that free Sociality is always to be preferred to Voluntary Organisation, and the latter to Legislation.

Nothing infuriates the full-blown Socialist more than the advocacy of the protection of the weak against the strong by an anti-Socialist, and especially his advocacy of Sociality for that purpose, for at the street corner the Socialist always represents his opponent as the advocate of the vested interests of the strong against the weak.

The Socialist will accuse him of stealing the

Socialist fire, and, in the last resort, will even accuse him of being a Socialist. Ex-President Roosevelt has been freely accused of Socialism, on account of his campaign against the trusts, and in an address at the New York Fair at Syracuse, in September 1910, he retorted to these accusations: "If the control of the corporations and the guaranteeing of a square deal between the rich and the poor is Socialism, why, make the most of it!"

The writer has had these accusations, of stealing Socialist fire, and of being a Socialist, levelled at him, both verbally and in the Socialist press; but the truth was candidly, if somewhat naïvely, expressed on one occasion by a Socialist lecturer, who declared that he was turning his guns on to them from the heart of their own position, of which he had dispossessed them. The Socialist does advocate Sociality, and endeavours to appropriate the work of Maurice, Kingsley, and Westcott, who, as we have seen, were not Socialists at all in the sense in which the term is now used. We shall see, in Chapter X., that State Socialism, whatever be its basis, is logically incompatible with Sociality, since, by annihilating individual freedom, and therefore personality, it leaves no room for the higher part of man's nature,

which alone can express itself in Sociality. An Anarchist might consistently advocate Sociality, provided his system of anarchy were based on the rational view of the world, but that would not prevent the condemnation of the system by its own inherent absurdity. A Communal Anarchist of the Morris type could not; for his system is based on Materialistic Determinism, which makes man a machine, and to imagine the possibility of social co-operation between machines is mere childish absurdity.

The rational view of the world, however, as presented in Chapter IX., is not merely consistent with the existence of Sociality, but provides a definite basis for it. According to this view, every human mind, although containing a self-determining principle, is in continuous relation to the all-pervading universal mind, or omnipresent intelligence, from which it is derived, and is, through the latter, in continuous relation with all other human minds. This provides the most fundamental basis for the brotherhood of man, elevating it from the mere figure of speech as which it is often regarded, into an eternal verity, giving it, in fact, an eternal value. It gives, moreover, a similar eternal value to the equality of man,

this equality being seen to consist in the community of nature of all human minds, inherent in the similarity of their relation to the universal mind, but in no way excluding the observed distinctions between individual minds. It presents these distinctions as merely differences in degree and not in kind.

The rational view of the world, moreover, when adequately realised, provides the strongest conceivable incentive to Sociality. For we shall see in Chapter X., that one of the conclusions to which it leads is that the law of man's being, which he is bound to seek and endeavour to fulfil, is the eternal law of Justice, of Harmony, and therefore of love and sympathy for others. We shall see, moreover, in Chapter XI., that it is unthinkable that the human personality should become extinct with the disintegration of the material body through which it functions. The law cannot, therefore, cease to operate at the death of the body. Man, like every other organism, *must* fulfil the law of his being. The freedom of his self-determination gives him the unique privilege of consciously seeking and endeavouring to fulfil this law—the law of justice and the law of love; for in their eternal values the two are one. The law of man's being does not call upon him to trample

upon himself. It calls upon him to realise himself to the utmost of his powers. Man, in his present state of existence, can only, as far as we know, function through his brain and the other material organs which constitute his body. But his body does not constitute his whole environment. The environment of one man differs greatly from that of another, both in quantity and in quality. The environment of the scientific and philosophic thinker extends as far into the depths of the universe as his observation and his reason can carry him, while that of the untutored labourer may not extend beyond his village, or the even more limited sphere of a factory town. The materialistic teaching of the Socialist accentuates and tends to perpetuate this inequality, while limiting even the wider sphere of the thinker. For the materialistic thinker of widest grasp is limited to purely material considerations. He cannot even know himself. He is not even aware of his own freedom, but believes himself to be the mere product and function of his surroundings. The wide universe of which he forms a part is to him but a derelict ship, drifting pilotless through the immensities of space and time, and he himself is but a creature born of its rottenness, battened down

beneath its hatches, somehow aware that he is there, utterly helpless, and wondering how and when he shall be snuffed out.

The humblest worker in the remotest wilds of savagery, who fashions with his hands images of the pilots whom he believes to control his destiny, has a wider environment, a nobler outlook upon life than this. Far wider, then, is the outlook of the humblest worker in a Christian land who, through his church or chapel, has access even to the feeblest and least adequate presentation of the great Teacher who created a new world for struggling humanity, and whose teaching, however inadequately presented, has been uplifting the race of mankind through the centuries. As I am not a theologian, and am not writing from the point of view of any school of theological thought, and am, moreover, addressing readers, some of whom would consider the opinions of any theological school as biased, I shall refer, in support of this claim, not in the main to Christian writers, but rather to those whose bias is in quite other directions. As regards the great Teacher Himself, my first two witnesses shall be Ernest Renan and John Stuart Mill. The former writer describes Jesus as "the founder of a new world" and "the Creator of the

everlasting Religion of Humanity." Comparing His teaching with that of the Stoics, those ancient teachers of the most austere morals, he writes:—

"The Gospel of Jesus has been, like the system of the Stoics, but with infinitely greater fulness, a living argument for the divine faculties in man, a high monument of the will's potency." He concludes his *Vie de Jésus* with the words:—

"Whatever may be the unexpected phenomena of times to come, Jesus will not be surpassed. His worship will renew its youth constantly; the story of His life will draw forth fresh tears; His suffering will soften the kindest hearts; all the ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there was none born greater than Jesus."

Elsewhere, Renan thus apostrophises Jesus in His last suffering:—

"Thou art destined to become the corner-stone of Humanity in such a degree that to tear Thy name from this world would be to shake it to its foundations."

The following are the words of John Stuart Mill:—

"Above all, the most valuable part of the effect on the character which Christianity has

produced, by holding up in a Divine Person a standard of excellence and a model for imitation, is available even to the absolute unbeliever and can never be lost to humanity. . . . Whatever else may be taken away from us by rational curiosity, Christ is still left; a unique figure, not more unlike all His precursors than are His followers, even those who had the direct benefit of His personal teaching. It is of no use to say that Christ as exhibited in the Gospels is not historical. . . . But who among His disciples or their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels. . . . When this pre-eminent genius is combined with the qualities of probably the greatest moral reformer and martyr to that mission, who ever existed upon earth, religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this man as their ideal representative and guide of humanity; nor, even now, would it be easy, even for an unbeliever, to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete, than to endeavour so to live that Christ would approve our life. When to this we add, that to the conception of the rational sceptic, it remains a possibility that Christ actually was what He

supposed Himself to be . . . a man charged with a special, express, and unique commission from God to lead men to truth and virtue, we may well conclude that the influences of religion on the character which will remain after rational criticism has done its utmost against the evidences of religion are well worth preserving."

It would be an insult to the memory of men of the stamp of Ernest Renan and John Stuart Mill to refer, on the same page, to the ignorant and vulgar vapourings of men whose intellectual capacities are measured by the fact that the inconsequences of Karl Marx, and even more obvious sophistries, present themselves to them as rational argument. Every Mohammedan child learns to speak of the Most High Jesus, while those modern Indian Yogis, representatives of the ancient Vedic philosophy, who have come in contact with Western thought, and studied the Christian writings, regard Jesus as the greatest of all the teachers sent by God for the uplifting of man. Some of them, indeed, teach that while the other great teachers, such as Buddha, had attained their wisdom and sanctity after many transmigrations, many successive lives passed upon earth in varied spheres of usefulness, Jesus alone was a soul

sent direct from God for the instruction of man.

The self-realisation leading to love and sympathy for others, the very essence of all Sociality, is therefore attainable to the humblest intelligence through Christian teaching, the ultimate ideal precepts of which are that man should love God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himself. And what is the meaning of love for God, except love of truth and justice, finding expression in love to his fellow, and not in love to his fellow-man merely, but, though in a lesser degree, in kindness and sympathy to his more lowly fellow-creatures in the animal world. The self-realisation involved in discovering and following out the law of man's being finds its expression in the widest possible conception of responsibility, of duty, expressed in terms of universal love and sympathy.

"Are nine-tenths of the evil-doers on earth not only to escape the penalty of their crimes, but often and often to be favoured reapers in the harvests of the world's success? You catch the common robber, or the man who steals—perhaps through starvation, penury, or through knowing no better—and you imprison him for years or for life; and is the rich usurer who has wrung the widow's farthing from her,

is the fraudulent banker, is the unjust judge, is the cruel spoiler of war to pass from a world that in millions and millions of cases gave them wealth and honours and stars and garters, instead of ropes and bars and gallows, to go forthwith to free pardon, to everlasting light and endless rest beyond the grave?" [1]

When man, in place of seeking thus to realise himself, chooses to slide downwards instead of rising upwards, he must, in accordance with the eternal law of justice, in his present existence or hereafter, be compelled to retrace his steps, driven by the pain which, throughout the sentient world as known to us, is nature's warning to the organism that is deviating from the law of its being. According to this law, every man, high or low, rich or poor, who lives a useless, even if not a harmful life, is falling downwards instead of rising upwards towards self-realisation. How much more is the man, falling instead of rising, who, in pursuit of ambition, or wealth, or other selfish object, tramples on his fellows. In accordance with the law of justice, he in his turn must be trampled upon, in another existence if not in this one, and all religions worthy of the name teach the truth of this scientific law.

[1] Sir William Butler, in his *Life of General Gordon.*

We see, then, that it is to religious teaching that we must mainly look for the promotion of that Sociality which is the most potent method of promoting social progress, in that while the other two methods aim at the restriction of the results of selfishness, the development of Sociality tends towards the elimination of selfishness itself; that is to say, it strikes at the root of all the evils existing in human communities. It is obvious that we need only concern ourselves with the highest form of religion, Christianity; and it will be of interest to glance briefly at what it has done for us in the past. My first witness shall be Lecky, who cannot be suspected of bias in favour of any theological system, and he writes :—

"By consolidating the heterogeneous and anarchical elements that succeeded the downfall of the Roman Empire; by infusing into Christendom the conception of a bond of unity that is superior to the divisions of nationhood, and of a moral tie which is superior to force; by softening slavery into serfdom and preparing the way for the ultimate emancipation of labour, Catholicism laid the very foundation of modern civilisation. Herself the most admirable of all organisations—political, municipal, and social—which supplied a large

proportion of the materials of almost every modern structure."

And on a later page he writes :[1]—

"That Church which often seemed so haughty and overbearing in its dealings with kings and nobles, never failed to listen to the poor and to the oppressed, and for many centuries their protection was the foremost of all the objects of its policy."

Mr. Gladstone, a Christian witness, writes in a very similar strain in his *Studies of Homer* :—

"Christianity has marched for fifteen hundred years at the head of human civilisation, and has driven, harnessed to its chariot as the horses of a triumphal car, the chief intellectual and material forces of the world. Its learning has been the learning of the world ; its art the art of the world ; its genius the genius of the world ; its greatness, glory, grandeur, and majesty have been almost, though not absolutely, all that in these respects the world has had to boast of."

We have seen how Socialists, while admitting the immense importance of Sociality, have, for the most part, attempted to destroy its very foundations by preaching the discarded doctrines of materialism, condemned throughout

[1] *History of Rationalism in Europe*, vol. ii. p. 37.

the ages by every system of philosophy and by every form of religious belief, and now utterly destroyed, for the whole world of thinkers, by the growth of scientific knowledge. Most Socialists also preach the absurd doctrine of Marx, based upon his inversion and utter misconception of the philosophy of Hegel, and upon the absurdities of his own economic theories, that the development of sociality, of love and sympathy, is to be attained through the discord of a class war of irreconcilable hostility. Ramsay MacDonald, as we saw in Chapter IV., has exposed its utter imbecility so plainly in the words there quoted, that I need add nothing to them. It is, indeed, a case of German pseudo-metaphysics run mad.

Voluntary Organisation differs from *Legislation* only in the motive power. Both involve regulative rules, but the motive power is simply free sociality in the first case, and penal sanction in the second. The general principles of legislation arrived at in Chapter X. will therefore apply also to voluntary organisation. We may therefore proceed to consider the chief existing evils, or diseases, of the community, with a view to seeking means of remedying them; and the chief of

these evils is what we may call *Social Parasitism.* "There are too many loafers in England. The only real difference between the rich man who does nothing but amuse himself, and the tramp, is that the one is presumably clean and the other is certainly dirty."

These are wise and pregnant words. Even the Socialist would agree to them with his whole heart, and with his mind too, such as it is. For Socialists are often good-hearted and well-meaning men. But Socialists are not wise and far-sighted. They are often benevolent although not beneficent, for they lack the reasoning faculty. And it is primarily by means of that faculty that men translate benevolence into beneficence, the mere desire of good results into their accomplishment.

The author of these wise words was Lord Selborne, and the occasion was his speech of July 1910 to the boys at Winchester School. Lord Selborne is a rich man who devotes his time, his energy, and his ability to the service of his country. He comes of an ancient and honourable line who have served their country for many generations. He is therefore the possessor of great hereditary advantages and strong

safeguards, with their corresponding responsibilities. There are many such, and there are many who, with smaller hereditary advantages, have risen, or are rising, into positions of wealth and responsibility, and who fully realise their responsibilities both to their country and to their less fortunate fellow-countrymen who may be more or less dependent on them, territorially or industrially. The estates of such men and the districts where their influence is preponderant are barren fields for the weed-sowing of the Socialist propagandist. There are others again, inheritors of ill-gotten wealth, who, in spite of their hereditary disadvantages, have realised the responsibilities which the mere possession of wealth confers, and are building up a reputation which shall go far to obliterate the memory of a past which is shame instead of honour, and to make atonement for the actions of their forefathers. Such men are worthy of double honour, as their ancestry is a burden instead of a safeguard and an incentive. It is from the latter class that the wealthy loafers are mainly recruited, but they are reinforced by deserters from the higher strata, and together form a parasitic community, increasing in numbers as we descend through the various strata of

society, until they meet the other parasitic community of wastrels, comprising the unemployable and criminal classes.

There is but little distinction to be detected in the nature of these different classes of parasites. The most culpable are those whose fall has been greater, for they started with the greatest advantages. All of them are essentially degenerates. There are, however, very definite differences in the methods of their sustenance. The lowest class evidently preys directly upon the community. The class above these, the loafers who exist uselessly upon ill-gotten wealth, derive their sustenance, not directly from the community, but from the store of energy laid up by their forefathers. Since, however, this store of energy was itself stolen from others, these parasities are preying indirectly upon the community. The remainder, who derive their sustenance from well-earned wealth, while themselves leading useless lives, do not in any sense prey upon the community. The energy stored up by their forefathers was acquired by service to the community, and is still rendering it service by supplying the means of production. The interest on the investments, by means of which the useless life is sustained, forms but a small proportion of the output

resulting from the capital invested. All the rest of it goes to the community. It therefore follows that the man who originally earned and saved the wealth has done far more good to the community, even after allowing for the support of the parasite upon a portion of the proceeds, than if he had spent it during his lifetime upon his own pleasure.

According to the conception of the Socialist, that society is a mere mechanism in a mechanical and purposeless world, society can have no cause of complaint against a loafer of this kind. There is no logical place in such a scheme for the ethical view that every man has duties to fulfil towards his fellows, and that the calls of duty are proportioned to his advantages. It is, as we have seen, only by extending and strengthening this concept of duty that we can hope to develop and extend Sociality, which offers the most promising, if not the only feasible, method of reducing parasitism to negligible dimensions. The parasitism in the higher strata of society is obviously, to a very large extent, the direct outcome of the practically materialistic outlook upon life, in which wealth, on account of the pleasures it promises, is regarded as its whole aim and object. One of the avowed objects of the

average Socialist is to extend this materialistic outlook instead of combating it. Another is to replace the habit of self-reliance by that of reliance on the State, and so to develop and intensify the parasitic tendency. At the same time he is loud in his asseverations that his remedy is a cure, a certain cure, and the only cure, for this and all other ills.

There can be no question, for any thoughtful student of history, that the development of such parasitical tendencies is the most dangerous disease with which any nation or community can be afflicted. If they are allowed to grow unchecked, they will inevitably lead to fatal disaster. The diseases of the body politic bear a close resemblance to those of the human body. There is a similar resemblance between those who profess to cure them. In the case of the human body we have the qualified physician and the advertising quack. The latter knows little or nothing of the body or its diseases, but is quite prepared to supply an infallible remedy. There are two varieties of such quacks—those who believe in their own powers, and those who don't. The latter are comparatively harmless, for what they want is the money of their dupes. They will generally supply remedies as harmless as

useless. The former are more dangerous, for they expect to succeed ; and when simpler remedies fail, they will resort to the most risky methods, with the sublime self-confidence characteristic of the lowest depth of ignorance. A quack of this type would willingly undertake to banish every parasite in the human body, and would end by killing the patient. The physician, on the other hand, would be perfectly aware that the only available method of completely eradicating the internal parasites of the human body would be by burning or boiling the body itself. He would, therefore, turn his attention to reducing their numbers as far as possible by methods which experience has shown to be both safe and efficacious.

In the cure of the body politic the statesman takes the place of the physician. Unfortunately, statesmen differ even more than doctors. For the doctors differ only in their methods, and their differences grow gradually smaller with the advance of medical knowledge. The aim of all doctors is the same—the patient's cure. Statesmen, however, differ as much in their aims as in their methods ; and this provides opportunities for the hordes of political quacks, the most popular of which, at the present

time, are the many types of Socialists. They differ among themselves every whit as much as the doctors of the Middle Ages. They nearly all agree, however, in the depth of their ignorance, and in their absolute self-confidence.

Let us take first the Socialist orator of the street corner. He describes in glowing terms how the Socialist State is to do everything for the people, and make every one happy and comfortable, with little or no exertion on their part. One of his hearers suggests hesitatingly that it might be dangerous to give so much power to the State. The State might prove a very hard master. He replies with an air of triumph: "There can be no fear of that, for you yourselves will be the State, you will simply be your own masters." And this kind of thing goes down with certain types of hearers. One may, after long and patient explanation, persuade some of them that the whole people cannot possibly directly exercise the functions of the executive government which constitutes the State. One may also convince a few by direct argument that if the State is to do everything for them, and they are to be the State, this simply means that they are to do everything for themselves, and that learning to rely upon the State rather

than upon themselves is a curious method of preparation for more complete self-reliance and self-help than they are now capable of.

A simple illustration is frequently found more convincing. The common furze is often afflicted by a thread-like parasitic creeper, the dodder. The seed of the dodder originally strikes root into the soil, but soon dies unless the roots encounter those of the furze, when they penetrate the latter, and feed upon its juices. As the creeper grows above ground, it clasps the furze closely and feeds upon it by emitting aerial roots, and when firmly established on the bush, the roots of the dodder die away, and all connection with the ground is severed. The dodder relies entirely upon its host, the furze-bush, just as the Socialist expects to rely upon the State. When the luxuriant growth of the dodder completely envelops the furze, the latter dies, leaving only the dodder, just as in the Socialist State, the State executive is to die away as the people become more flourishing. But the roots of the dodder have been entirely transferred to the furze, just as the Socialist people is to rely on the State. The dodder therefore withers and dies with the bush; and the same must be the end of the Socialist nation, which

has entirely exchanged self-reliance for reliance on the State. When the State dies by becoming completely merged in the people, there will be nothing more to lean on, and destruction must come upon the enfeebled nation.

This sort of folly, however, is merely for the street corner. It is useful in catching ignorant voters. The intellectual leaders know better. Their ideal, as we have seen, is that the mass of the people should depend upon the executive only to control them, and to control them rigidly. The leaders would drive and the people be driven. It would be for the leaders to fix the remuneration and the conditions of life, both for themselves and for the people under their control.

Let us now turn from the quack to the physician, from the Socialist to the statesman. Like the physician, the statesman will first carefully investigate and diagnose the case in the light of historical and personal experience. He will recognise the impossibility of completely eliminating those who lead useless lives upon the investments of their fathers. He will realise that the ethical claim which the community has upon every one of its units can only be made effective by means of the growth of a healthy public opinion, by the development

of Sociality. He may be of opinion that the concentration of power in individual hands through the accumulation of enormous fortunes is in itself undesirable. The quack would at once propose their restriction, perhaps by taxing the larger amounts to the verge of extinction. The statesman will realise that modern civilisation is of such complexity that hasty action is almost certain to give rise to evils more serious than those which it is designed to remedy. He will bring all his knowledge and experience to bear, and will find that in countries where the inequalities are greatest, as in the United States, the general standard of living is highest. These are the countries where the workmen are most highly paid, and have the greatest freedom, and the most ample opportunity of improving their position by industry and thrift; while in countries like Bulgaria, where the inequalities are least, the living standard is at its lowest.

Turning his attention to the lowest strata, he will note the effect of *sweating* in damaging the industry of the country and increasing the numbers of the unemployable and criminal classes. He will then seek, with the same care and consideration, to discover if there be any possibility of reducing these evils by

further legislative or executive methods, always bearing in mind that it is the function of the Government to remove obstacles to the free development of its citizens, to afford opportunity and guidance where necessary, but in no case to impede the development of self-help and self-reliance by doing for any class of the community anything which, with due effort, it can accomplish for itself.

He will endeavour to diminish the over-pressure of the people in the towns, and to promote self-reliance and increase the stability of the nation by providing opportunity for the industrious and thrifty workers in town and country to become owners of their own dwellings and of agricultural holdings. He will endeavour, moreover, to educate the people in the methods of social co-operation most conducive to their moral and material well-being.

These measures would very greatly reduce, and in time probably eliminate entirely, the glut of helpless labour which is the essential basis of the *sweating* system. They would not, however, be sufficient in themselves. In the first place, any general improvement in the minimum standard of living in this country would increase the influx from abroad. This,

however, could probably be restricted within harmless limits without serious additional legislation, merely by the due enforcement of the existing Alien Immigration Acts, modified in any respects in which they are found to be ineffective. These measures would, however, take time, and the question of *sweated* labour is one that cries aloud for remedy without delay. The conditions in some of the *sweated* industries, especially those in which women are employed, are a disgrace to a country that calls itself Christian. They are a disgrace to civilised humanity. In many cases the conditions could be much improved by voluntary organisation; in others legislation will probably be requisite. The trade unions could render invaluable assistance in this direction, and perhaps they may be induced to do so, now that the Osborne judgment has freed them from the thraldom of the Socialistic minority who are fundamentally opposed to every principle of trade unionism, and who are aiming, not at the better organisation of industry, and the consequent improvement of the position of the workers, but at its disorganisation and destruction, in order that they may have the opportunity of putting into practice some one of their numerous incongruous schemes of

imbecile folly, each one of which is proclaimed by its adherents to be the sure and only method of bringing about an earthly paradise for the worker.

In many cases the absence of any organisation amongst the women workers leads to their being treated with the most callous indifference, even in trades which cannot be normally classed as *sweated* trades. I could instance, for example, firms carrying on similar businesses in the same town, all of which employ mainly women workers. In one case every employee earns not only a good, but a high, average wage throughout the year. The trade is subject to considerable seasonal fluctuations, and this difficulty is met by an equal reduction of time all round during the slack periods. This only requires a little care and forethought, and prevents any individual hardship. In other cases individual workers are thrown out of work at a day's notice, and left, sometimes for weeks at a time, daily expecting a recall to work. The employers or managers do not trouble themselves about the consequences to the workers. If some fall into ruin and degradation, others are available in their place. Some of these men go to church, or it may be to chapel, on Sundays. As Mr. Haweis used

to say, they then pull a long face and look very pious. But from Monday morning to Saturday night they are employed in trampling upon their fellows in the pursuit of wealth and comfort for themselves. They are just as much devil-worshippers as the most ignorant negro devotee of the snake god. They have no conception of the Creator whose law is the law of justice, of love, and sympathy. They may endeavour to veil their foulness from others, and perhaps even from themselves, by the canting hypocrisy of a pretended religion, while the real object of their reverence is the product of their own degraded minds, a deity whose favour can be gained by the sycophancy and flattery which they lavish without stint upon those who are wealthier than themselves. These canting hypocrites are more offensive to the clean-minded man than the wild beast who proclaims himself such, and, believing neither in God nor man, admits that his god is his belly, and that his sole aim is to satisfy it. But the law of justice is the law of the universe, and all will in due course reap as they have sowed.

The first step towards the suppression of *sweating* by voluntary organisation should be a full and impartial investigation, by

responsible committees, of all alleged cases of sweating, and when substantiated they should be relentlessly exposed. If this were done thoroughly by bodies whose impartiality and judgment commanded general confidence, it could not fail to create a sufficiently powerful body of opinion to greatly diminish the evil by cutting off the market for the products of such conditions. In the case of sweated trades in which there is an unproductive surplus of the nature considered in Chapter III., the effect would be in every way beneficial, as the existence of a surplus in a *sweated* trade shows that the employers are exploiting the workers, and thereby damaging the efficiency of the industrial system. In such cases, should voluntary organisation prove ineffective, there would be a definite indication of the necessity for legislation. If, however, as is certainly the case in many of the *sweated* trades, the *sweaters* themselves are earning only a bare subsistence, there will be no unproductive surplus out of which the wages of the workers may be increased. One of two things must then happen. Either the cost of production would fall upon the consumers, that is to say, upon higher grades of the community, or the trade would be destroyed. In the latter case

the *sweated* workers would either have to be transferred to other work or they would be reduced to pauperism. The latter alternative would be a worse state of things than before. The destruction of the trade would, generally, if not always, be effected by the substitution of cheap foreign goods for the home-made ones, and this could hardly be prevented by any method other than a protective import duty. The replacement of the home-made goods by foreign ones at the same price would be no disadvantage if it were possible to transfer the *sweated* workers to other better paid occupations. It is obvious that this could not be effected by any method, legislative or otherwise, directed simply to the suppression of *sweating;* for, if such better paid work were available, the workers would, of their own accord, abandon that which was worse paid.

The only alternative to a protective duty would therefore be a diminution in the glut of labour, and this would be a method in every way preferable. Now the *sweated* industries are, as a rule, town industries, and the only method of reducing the glut in the labour market would be by withdrawing some of the population from the towns and settling them in

the country. It is an absolutely uncontested, and incontestable fact, that the *sweating* of industry is not only an offence to every principle of humanity, but a canker in the industrial system, which directly impairs its efficiency, and is a great impediment to the social progress of the community. The principles arrived at in Chapter X. therefore completely justify the interference of the State in order to endow the poorer classes of the community with property of their own. These principles, moreover, provide a double justification for such a course, for, as we shall presently see, the property which was formerly much more largely diffused than at present, has in the past been very largely taken from the poorer classes by means of class legislation definitely directed to the enrichment of the strong at the expense of the weak. This was pre-eminently the case in Ireland, and afforded the most incontestable justification for the principles of the Irish Land Legislation which is rapidly restoring prosperity and contentment to the agricultural population of that country by enabling the peasant, with the assistance of State Credit, to become a proprietor. The extension of a similar system to this country appears to be the most promising of all the proposals which have been

made for the abolition of *sweated* labour, and for the provision of a system of insurance against temporary unemployment. Why should not some system of settlement, on the same lines as in the case of large estates, be applied to such holdings, so that they should belong rather to the family than the individual, and be incapable of alienation in favour of creditors or otherwise? In order to make such small holdings self-supporting it would probably be necessary to afford them some easement from local and Imperial taxation, but this would only be in accordance with the general principle that taxation should be directed immediately to the unproductive surplus, and should never be imposed upon the costs of industry. The latter is often attempted, but it is ruinous and wasteful, for the costs, being unable to bear it, it becomes, in time, automatically shifted on to the surplus. The process of shifting, however, is an expensive and wasteful one, and may give rise to much unnecessary suffering.

The Socialists cannot lay claim to the initiation of such land proposals, for they offer the most strenuous opposition to them, for the very simple reason that they are well aware of the peace and contentment which would be the result of such a course. And peace and

contentment are not conditions favourable to Socialist propaganda.

Such proposals have been advocated for many years by far-seeing political economists, but it was the Christian Church which first brought them within the sphere of practical politics. It was in the year 1891 that the head of the oldest and greatest division of that Church, Pope Leo XIII., issued his famous encyclical dealing with the conditions of the working-classes. It is published by the Catholic Truth Society in a penny pamphlet of fifty-three pages, and is well worthy of careful study, as the following quotations will show :—

"That the spirit of revolutionary change, which has long been disturbing the nations of the world, should have passed beyond the sphere of politics and made its influence felt in the cognate sphere of practical economics is not surprising. The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable, in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits and the marvellous discoveries of science ; in the changed relations between masters and workmen ; in the enormous fortunes of some few individuals, and the utter poverty of the masses ; in the increased self-reliance and closer mutual combination of the working-classes; as also, finally, in the prevailing

moral degeneracy. The momentous gravity of the state of things now obtaining fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men are discussing it; practical men are proposing schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and rulers of nations are all busied with it—and actually there is no question which has taken a deeper hold on the public mind."

"To remedy these wrongs the Socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that by thus transferring property from private individuals to the community, the present mischievous state of things will be set to rights, inasmuch as each citizen will then get his fair share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their contentions are so clearly powerless to end the controversy that were they carried into effect the working-man himself would be among the first to suffer. They are, moreover, emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring State action into a sphere not within its competence, and create utter confusion in the community."

"It seems amazing that some should now be setting up anew certain obsolete opinions in opposition to what is here laid down. They assert that it is right for private persons to have the use of the soil and its various fruits, but that it is unjust for any one to possess outright either the land on which he has built, or the estate which he has brought under cultivation. But those who deny these rights do not perceive that they are defrauding man of what his own labour has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition; it was wild before, now it is fruitful; was barren, but now brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved the land becomes so truly part of itself as to be in great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that the fruit of a man's own sweat and labour should be possessed and enjoyed by any one else? As effects follow their cause, so is it just and right that the results of labour should belong to those who have bestowed their labour.

"With reason, then, the common opinion of mankind, little affected by the few dissentients who have contended for the opposite view, has found in the careful study of nature, and in the

laws of nature, the foundations of the division of property, and the practice of all ages has consecrated the principle of private ownership, as being pre-eminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquillity of human existence.

"Religion teaches the labouring man and the artisan to carry out honestly and fairly all equitable agreements freely entered into; never to injure the property, nor to outrage the person, of an employer; never to resort to violence in defending their own cause, nor to engage in riot or disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises, and excite foolish hopes which usually end in useless regrets, followed by insolvency. Religion teaches the wealthy owner and the employer that their work-people are not to be accounted their bondsmen; that in every man they must respect his dignity and worth as a man and as a Christian; that labour is not a thing to be ashamed of, if we lend ear to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is an honourable calling, enabling a man to sustain his life in a way upright and creditable; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like

chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle and physical power. Again, therefore, the Church teaches that, as religion and things, spiritual and mental, are among the working-man's main concerns, the employer is bound to see that the worker has time for his religious duties; that he be not exposed to corrupting influences and dangerous occasions; and that he be not led away to neglect his home and family, or to squander his earnings. Furthermore, the employer must never tax his work-people beyond their strength, or employ them in work unsuited to their sex or age. His great and principal duty is to give every one a fair wage. Doubtless before deciding whether wages are adequate, many things have to be considered; but wealthy owners and all masters of labour should be mindful of this—that to exercise pressure upon the indigent and the destitute for the sake of gain, and to gather one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine. To defraud any one of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of Heaven. '*Behold, the hire of the labourers . . . which by fraud hath been kept back by you, crieth aloud; and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord*

of Sabaoth.'[1] Lastly, the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workmen's earnings, whether by force, by fraud, or by usurious dealing; and with all the greater reason because the labouring man is, as a rule, weak and unprotected, and because his slender means should in proportion to their scantiness be accounted sacred."

"Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed out, would they not be sufficient of themselves to keep under all strife and all its causes?"

"A State chiefly prospers and thrives through moral rule, well-regulated family life, respect for religion and justice, the moderation and equal allocation of public taxes, the progress of the arts and of trade, the abundant yield of the land—through everything, in fact, which makes the citizens better and happier. Hereby, then, it lies in the power of a ruler to benefit every class in the State, and amongst the rest to promote to the utmost the interests of the poor; and this in virtue of his office, and without being open to any suspicion of undue interference—since it is the province of the State to consult the common good. And the more that is done for the benefit of the

[1] St. James v. 4.

working-classes by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for special means to relieve them.

"There is another and deeper consideration which must not be lost sight of. As regards the State, the interests of all, whether high or low, are equal. The poor are members of the national community equally with the rich; they are real component living members which constitute, through the family, the living body; and it need hardly be said that they are in every State very largely in the majority. It would be irrational to neglect one portion of the citizens and favour another; and therefore the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working-classes; otherwise that law of justice will be violated which ordains that each man shall have his due.

"Justice, therefore, demands that the interests of the poorer classes should be carefully watched over by the administration, so that they who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits which they create—that being housed, clothed, and enabled to sustain life, they may find their existence less hard and more endurable. It follows that whatever shall appear to prove

conducive to the well-being of those who work, should obtain favourable consideration. Let it not be feared that solicitude of this kind will be harmful to any interest; on the contrary, it will be to the advantage of all; for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to shield from misery those on whom it so largely depends."

"The first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of greedy speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments for money-making. It is neither just nor human so to grind men down with excessive labour as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is developed and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labour, therefore, should be so regulated as not to be protracted over longer hours than strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be must depend on the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workman. Those who work in mines and quarries, and extract coal, stone, and metals from the bowels of the earth, should have

shorter hours in proportion as their labour is more severe and trying to health. Then, again, the season of the year should be taken into account; for not unfrequently a kind of labour is easy at one time which at another is intolerable or exceedingly difficult. Finally, work which is quite suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or a child. And, in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently developed. For just as very rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so does too early an experience of life's hard toil blight the young promise of a child's faculties, and render any true education impossible. Women, again, are not suited for certain occupations; a woman is by nature fitted for home-work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty and to promote the good bringing-up of children, and the well-being of the family. As a general principle it may be laid down that a workman ought to have leisure and rest proportionate to the wear and tear of his strength; for waste of strength must be repaired by cessation from hard work."

"We now approach a subject of great and urgent importance, and one in respect of which, if extremes are to be avoided, right notions are absolutely necessary. Wages, as we are told, are regulated by free consent, and therefore the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part, and seemingly is not called upon to do anything beyond. The only way, it is said, in which injustice might occur would be if the master refused to pay the whole of the wages, or if the workman should not complete the work undertaken; in such cases the State should intervene, to see that each obtains his due; but not under any other circumstances.

"This mode of reasoning is, to a fair-minded man, by no means convincing, for there are important considerations which it leaves out of account altogether. To labour is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and chief of all, for self-preservation. *In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat thy bread.*[1] Hence a man's labour bears two notes or characters. First of all, it is *personal*, inasmuch as the exertion of individual strength belongs to the individual who puts it forth, employing such

[1] Genesis iii. 19.

strength to procure that personal advantage on account of which it was bestowed. Secondly, man's labour is *necessary;* for without the result of labour a man cannot live; and self-preservation is a law of nature, which it is wrong to disobey. Now, were we to consider labour so far as it is *personal* merely, doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatsoever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so is he free to accept a small remuneration, or even none at all. But this is a mere abstract supposition; the labour of the working-man is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary*, and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of one and all, and to be wanting therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live, and the poor can procure it in no other way than through work and wages.

"Let it be, then, taken for granted that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and, in particular, should agree freely as to the wages; nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, that

remuneration ought to be sufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage-earner. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labour in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, &c.—in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the State, especially as circumstances, times, and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to societies or boards, such as we shall mention presently, or to some other mode of safeguarding the interests of the wage-earners; the State being appealed to, should circumstances require, for its sanction and protection.

"If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife, and his children in reasonable comfort, he will not find it difficult, if he be a sensible man, to study economy; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by some little savings and thus secure a small income. Nature and reason alike would urge him to this. We have seen that this great Labour question cannot be

solved save by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favour ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many as possible of the humbler class to become owners.

"Many excellent results will follow from this; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the result of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely differing castes. On the one side there is the party which holds power because it holds wealth; which has in its grasp the whole of labour and trade; which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is even represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, broken down and suffering, and ever ready for disturbance. If working-people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the consequence will be that the gulf between vast wealth and sheer poverty will be bridged over, and the respective classes will be brought nearer to one another. A further consequence will result in the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder

and more readily when they work on that which belongs to them; nay, they learn to love the very soil that yields, in response to the labour of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. That such a spirit of willing labour would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community is self-evident. And a third advantage would spring from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a decent and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can be reckoned on only provided that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is derived from nature, not from man; and the State has the right to control its use in the interests of the public good alone, but by no means to absorb it altogether. The State would therefore be unjust and cruel if, under the name of taxation, it were to deprive the private owner of more than is fitting.

"In the last place, employers and workmen may of themselves effect much in the matter we are treating, by means of such associations

and organisations as afford opportune aid to those who are in distress, and which draw the two classes more closely together. Among these may be enumerated societies for mutual help; various benevolent foundations established by private persons to provide for the workman, and for his widow or his orphans, in case of sudden calamity, in sickness, and in the event of death; and what are called *patronages*, or institutions for the care of boys and girls, for young people, as well as homes for the aged.

"The most important of all are Workingmen's Unions; for these virtually include all the rest. History attests what excellent results were brought about by the Artificers' Guilds of olden times. They were the means of affording not only many advantages to the workmen, but in no small degree of promoting the advancement of art, as numerous monuments remain to bear witness.

"Private societies, then, although they exist within the State, and are severally part of the State, cannot nevertheless be absolutely, and as such, prohibited by the State. For to enter into a *society* of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State is bound to protect natural rights, not to destroy them; and if it

forbid its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence; for both they and it exist in virtue of the like principle, namely, the natural tendency of man to dwell in society.

"There are occasions, doubtless, when it is fitting that the law should intervene to prevent association; as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unlawful, or dangerous to the State. In such cases public authority may justly forbid the formation of associations, and may dissolve them if they already exist. But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals, and not to impose unreasonable regulations under pretence of public benefit."

Professor Thorold Rogers[1] tells us that—

"Organisation was the essence of early English life. In the country every man belonged to a parish or manor, and, to use a modern phrase, had a stake in it. The landless man was an outlaw, a thief, a brigand."

There was similar organisation in the towns, and in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and as Professor Rogers tells us (p. 298), the principle of association was extended

[1] *Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 295.

beyond these original units, by the Artificers' Guilds referred to by the Venerable Pope, and which had ramifications spreading throughout the country. Their property was derived from "grants or charges on land and houses," and, although these charges usually originated in connection with religious offices —the offering of regular prayers for the dead— the funds so accumulated were mainly employed, like those of modern benefit societies, in giving aid to impoverished members of the various guilds. These guilds should, in the ordinary course, have been maintained, and have gradually modified their forms in order to meet the requirements of the development of modern industry. No one has even dreamed of raising any objection to the combinations of small capitalists into the sometimes large organisations known as joint-stock companies. The trade guild or trade union is simply an application of the same principle to labour. No single capitalist would be strong enough to finance a great railway system ; but no difficulty is found in financing such enterprises by combinations of many capitalists, each of whom may contribute only a comparatively small amount. Individually they are too poor for such an undertaking, but collectively they are rich

enough to carry it out. Now, as Rogers observes (p. 313):—

"The workman has only one thing to sell, the skill of his hands. This commodity, to use economic terms, is exceedingly perishable. If it be unsupported by its necessary supply, it rapidly deteriorates. Labour, unlike other finished articles in demand, cannot be kept out of the market without prodigious loss to the owner."

The workman, therefore, occupies a weak position relatively to that of the capitalist and the landlord in enforcing his claims to his due share of the surplus over and above the costs of maintenance and growth of the industry. If, however, all workmen of any one craft could be combined in a joint-stock corporation, the necessity of their work to the employers would give them the strength to demand probably even more than their due share of the surplus. It would not, however, make it possible for them to obtain such remuneration as would reduce the share of the employer below the subsistence level required to evoke the requisite capital and directivity; as such demands, if persisted in, would simply destroy the industry. Such a universal combination is neither attainable nor desirable, as what is

required in accordance with justice is, not that the labourer should absorb all the available surplus, but that he should obtain a just share. The fact that such combinations of labour could diminish the remuneration of the employer, and, in Rogers's words—

"Perhaps prevent the growth of rent, is the key to the prolonged struggle . . . in which the workmen were for two centuries a victorious, and for three a defeated class. The combination which in capital was considered beneficent, in labour was treated as felony, and even when the felony was extinguished by abrogating the labour statutes, was left to the elastic interpretation of the common law doctrine of conspiracy, if there be a common law doctrine of anything. . . . In recent times intelligent employers have begun to see that what economists, who understood facts, defend as the right of the workmen, has its advantages from the point of view of the master. The practice adopted in many trades, where a unit of value can be easily taken and understood, is to make that unit the basis of a sliding scale. I have been told by persons engaged in the iron trades that the system of a sliding scale works well. I can well believe it, because it assists in settling what is always of interest to the

producer, the anticipation of price. As I have often stated, the anticipation of a price is the problem before the capitalist producer, the regulation of market values, the one desideratum of those who engage in productive industry. Besides, the profits of the capitalist and the remuneration of the labourer are both forms of wages, the question between the two being merely a settlement as to the share due to each."

Rogers tells us (p. 239) that—

"For 200 years and more, the representatives of rent tried to depress wages by force of law, in the interests of rent, and failed. So complete was the failure that, in 1495, the legislature enacted that scale of wages for which the workmen had contended, and so left them in the possession of the situation. The workman had his trade union and benefit society in the guild to which he belonged. . . . The condition of the country was eminently one of small holdings. In a Surrey village, Tandridge, there were, in 1600, forty-nine owners or occupiers, whose average holding is nineteen and a half acres, and I have no doubt that such holdings continued for more than a century longer. A peasant who has land is in a much better position to make an

independent contract for his labour than one who is landless."

We see, then, that the policy of the wide diffusion of ownership amongst the peasants, the workmen, and the larger tenants, is no untried experiment. It is an attempt to re-introduce conditions which centuries of practical experience have shown to be in the highest degree conducive to prosperity. We have now to inquire how it was that these conditions of prosperity were abrogated, and for this purpose we shall again have recourse to the same work of Professor Thorold Rogers, whose researches have played so large a part in clearing the ground for, and demonstrating beyond all question the beneficial effect of, the policy of the wider diffusion of ownership. Rogers tells us that—

"In the reign of Henry VIII. (p. 34) the mass of English labourers, by no means claiming more than the reasonable reward for their services, were thriving under their guilds and trade unions; the peasants gradually acquiring land, and becoming the numerous small freeholders of the first half of the seventeenth century; the artisans the master hands in their craft, contractors in the same period for considerable works, planning the solid and

handsome structures in what is known as the Perpendicular style, and withal working with their own hands on the buildings which their shrewdness and experience had planned. It is true that at the very best age of the workman a ruin was impending, the causes of which I have been able to collect. . . . During the whole of English history there never was a sovereign so outrageously and wantonly extravagant as Henry. . . . If he could have got at it, he would have spent all the private wealth of his subjects, and he made every effort to get at it. . . . He was popular in a way, for wasteful people generally are, even when they waste what does not belong to them. The smaller monasteries went, and he soon came to an end of their accumulations. The larger ones he spared, declaring them to be the seats of piety and religion. He pledged himself that the spoil of the monasteries given him, he would ask the people for no more taxes, not even for necessary wars. Soon the greater monasteries went. . . . It is exceedingly probable that the accumulations of these holy places were, as bullion, equal to all the money in circulation at the time. It vanished like snow in summer. Nothing stayed with him apparently for a longer time than he could

hurl it away. The lands of the monasteries were said to have been a third of the English soil."

A very large proportion of this was property held in trust for the poor, and, in addition, a third of the church tithes had, since the reign of the Saxon King Ethelred, been legally claimable on their behalf. Therefore, the Socialist leader, Mr. Hyndman, writes:[1]—

"Thus the poor who had ever obtained relief from the Church, the wayfarers who could always find food and shelter in the religious houses, the children of the people who repaired to the convent for guidance and teaching, were deprived at one fell swoop of alms, shelter, and schools."

Now let us turn again to Professor Thorold Rogers (p. 36) for the continuation of the story:—

"After these exploits he seems to have hardly dared to ask his people for money. But there still remained a way in which he could most effectually attack their pockets. He began to issue base money, at first with very little alloy beyond what had been customary. He soon became shameless, for his mint kept issuing baser and baser coins. . . .

[1] *Historical Basis of Socialism in England*, p. 32.

At last, when the wretch was sinking into his grave, . . . he bethought himself of robbing the labourers and artisans, by confiscating their guild lands. The mischief begun by Henry was continued by the guardians of his son. It is impossible to speak with too much contempt of the crew whom Henry left to watch over and advise the young prince. . . . When Elizabeth came to the throne both sovereign and people were miserably poor. The base money had driven the working-classes to beggary, and England, once the most powerful of Western States, was of little more account in the policy of Europe than a petty German princedom was. The Queen's first task and first duty was to reform the currency. But she could not afford to make good her father's and brother's dishonesty."

Therefore, as Professor Rogers resumes (p. 240):—

"The circumstances which led to the total rout and subjection of the workmen were, first, the deluge of base money. The amount of this was equal to the average coinage of gold and silver for any seven years during Elizabeth's reign, and was almost certainly equal to any ten years' coinage of her father's reign. When base money is put into circulation by

rulers, the heaviest loss, nearly the whole loss, falls on the poor. This is what makes the crime of the smasher so peculiarly infamous. Then came the confiscation of the guild lands, and the loss of all the benefit societies' funds, an act of embezzlement of which Somerset was guilty, who added the crime of hypocrisy to that of robbery, for his plea was that the endowments were devoted to superstitious ends. Next comes the inevitable rise in prices. . . . Finally came the statute 5 Elizabeth, cap. 4, under which the labourer's and artisan's wages were fixed by Quarter Sessions assessments, severe penalties being denounced against those who took more or gave more than the justices allowed. This famous Act, which consummated the degradation of the poor, made pauperism inevitable, and misery universal, was really no new legislation. . . . What it did was to seize the opportunity when the workmen were helpless, to consolidate all the old statutes, to draw up rigid rules of apprenticeship, so as to make agricultural the residuum of all labour, to enact exhaustive penalties, and to leave no loophole through which workmen could escape, so as to better themselves in the struggle with their employers. The English Statute-Book contains many atrocious Acts,

most of them with hypocritical preambles. This Act of Elizabeth is, in my judgment, the most infamous of them, for it was levelled against every right of the poor, even of the poor to live, and entirely in the interest of rent."

Rogers tells us that he finds that, in spite of the penalties, the wages actually paid were a good deal above the justices' assessments. "Employers were more generous than the *little tyrants of the fields*." The assessments themselves, as far as they have been discovered, would not, Rogers tells us—

"Even if the peasant had continuous employment, find bread for him and his household. It was inevitable that he should be driven on private or public charity, on the alms of the generous, or on taxes levied for his maintenance on all occupiers."

The latter half of the seventeenth century saw the beginning of a great improvement in the methods of agriculture, mainly due to the intelligent efforts of the landowners, the result of which was to increase the wages during this period by about 50 per cent. The landowners reaped their advantage in obtaining an increased rental, and neither of these increases was at the expense of the consumer, but arose

purely from the increased efficiency of intelligently directed labour. This justifiable increase continued throughout the eighteenth century, but during the nineteenth rents were forced up far beyond their legitimate value, only to fall ultimately to a much lower value than would have been the case had the landowners had the intelligence to be content with legitimate results. The result, as we all know, has been to inflict large, and totally unnecessary, loss upon all concerned—landowners, farmers, and labourers. Considerable, and totally unjustifiable, encroachments on common land, more especially in the South of England, were made in the course of last century.

One great cause of suffering to the wage-earners is the fluctuation in employment which appears to be inevitable in any system of industry. We saw in Chapter III. that this would be diminished by the more equitable division of what we have called the *surplus product* of the industry. It is, however, hardly conceivable that it could be entirely eliminated. It might be further decreased if the Government, and other large consumers, could be induced to look further ahead, and allow a longer time for the execution of contracts.

This fluctuation is provided against, in the

case of the higher grades of labour, in a very efficient manner, by the payment of an unemployed benefit allowance. It is, however, impossible to extend this to the unskilled workers, who suffer most in this manner, for the simple reason that the casual nature of their employment, and the low rate of wages paid, makes it impossible for them to maintain an adequate trade union benefit fund. Mr. Cyril Jackson, in his valuable little book, *Unemployment and Trade Unions*, points out that a Government subsidy to the unions of these workers would be far more economical and far more efficient than the relief works which has hitherto been the only method employed to alleviate the distress arising from this source.

This appears to the author a wise suggestion, and this and many other reforms might be effected by the trade union leaders if only the men could be induced to choose leaders who understand, not only the requirements of the members, but the nature of the industry in which they are engaged. During recent years the unions have unfortunately fallen very largely under the domination of Socialist leaders whose aim is mainly to disorganise the existing system of industry in the hope of creating conditions favourable to the introduction of

some one or other of the wild-cat schemes propounded by would-be leaders whose qualifications consist in glibness of speech combined with the sublime self-confidence characteristic of the lowest depths of ignorance.

The effect of this has been twofold. In the first place it has dissipated the energies of trade unionism, which should have been employed in intelligent promotion of the workmen's interests, in the pursuit of absurd and utterly impossible ideals; in the second place it has aroused the opposition of the Masters' Federation, and of all who have brains and know how to use them. Thinking men will not co-operate with those whom they see to be actuated by ideals, the realisation of which would be destructive both to masters and workmen. All thinking men are agreed that men from the workman's bench should sit in the House of Commons, and that it is essential to the prosperity of the country that means should be provided for enabling them to do so. They should, however, not be attached specially to one of the great political parties, but, like members representing other interests, should sit on both sides of the House. It is only in this manner that the real interests of labour can be advanced, by keeping them

outside the domain of mere party interests. Above all, it is essential that the members specially representing labour interests should not become identified with the unpractical dreamers and soft-headed sentimentalists who form the body of believers in the superstition called Socialism.

We may now pause for a moment and compare the statesmanlike method of reason and historical inquiry with the method of the Socialist quack. The latter endeavours to make out a case for the assistance of labour towards a larger share of the product of industry on the basis of the absurd theories and the misstatements of fact which have been exposed in earlier chapters. He stands at the street corner and tells the workers that capital is their enemy, that they are entitled to the whole of the product of industry, and that wages have been steadily falling for centuries. All these statements we have seen to be absolutely false. The method of inquiry on the basis of reason and experience has, on the other hand, shown that labour has such a claim, and indicated methods of meeting it which experience has shown to be both feasible and efficient. The Socialists, moreover, have no present remedy to offer. They only ask leave to destroy and

disorganise, in order to try their 'prentice hands upon paper schemes of reconstruction of the most diverse character, most of which have been tried and proved to be failures, and all of which are based upon theories which have been proved to be absurd.

It is the existence of the surplus considered in Chapter III. which provides an intelligible basis for the labour movement, so that as Hobson writes: —

"Trade unionism will rank as an organised attempt to divert rents, excessive interests and profit, and other 'unearned' income into wages. In thus interpreting the main function of trade unionism, it is not necessary to assume that the miners, who, by collective power of bargaining, extort a share of what would otherwise be surplus mining dividends, have any natural or inherent right to this surplus, on the ground that they made it, or that they need it more than other workers. This would be trade individualism based on a defective grasp of the organic character of industry. The miners have no special claim in nature or in social justice upon the surplus that emerges in the mining industry, nor have the cotton spinners upon the high profits of a cotton boom. This

[1] *The Industrial System*, p. 208.

sectional action of trade unions ranks as a makeshift method of redressing the balance of power between the factors of production which we see everywhere struggling each to get for itself as much as possible of the surplus product. In certain industrial conditions the landowner, in others the capitalist, is the strongest, and takes most of the available surplus in high rents or dividends—normally in developed industrial nations the owners of organising and managing ability hold the balance of power."

We have seen, however, that labour is, as a rule, the weakest of the factors, and therefore such combination is necessary in order to secure to it its fair share of "wages of progressive efficiency." Where such is the case, the effect of the trade union action will have the distinct justification of social utility. As Hobson observes:—

"If land takes too much, capital and labour are both starved, and progress is correspondingly retarded. If capital or ability takes too much, and labour not enough, industrial progress continues to lag, for the healthy march of industry requires a proportionate advance of all the factors."

The Labour movement, in its widest aspect,

may therefore be regarded as "an attempt to equalise opportunities among the factors, so as to produce a more socially profitable circulation of wealth."

This is very clearly exemplified when we consider the recurrent depressions observed in the industrial system, giving rise to widespread unemployment. I consider that Hobson makes out a good case for his contention[1] that such a depression is invariably due to "the simultaneous excess of all the factors of production. In a full depression all the forms of capital and labour are there, but they cannot produce." The only reason for such underproduction must be that the produce cannot be sold at a price which would cover the cost of production. The cause must therefore be due to a condition of under-consumption, and, under normal conditions, this will mean that there is a deficiency in spending, and a corresponding excess of saving. Such conditions would obviously be a consequence of the abnormal increase of the larger incomes in proportion to the smaller ones, as such increase would not cause increased expenditure in proportion to its amount, and Hobson shows that such accumulations of surplus income would

[1] *The Industrial System*, chap. xviii., "Unemployment."

naturally tend to produce a series of fluctuations of alternating depressions and periods of increased activity. Such fluctuations are economically as well as socially harmful, as it can be shown that they will diminish the average rate of production. They therefore afford indications that the working-classes are receiving less than the share which would be most conducive to the prosperity of the industry as a whole. Under these circumstances the action of trade unions in obtaining a larger share of the surplus product for the working-classes would both stimulate consumption on their part, and reduce the oversaving on the part of the possessors of the larger incomes, and so benefit the system of industry. It follows, therefore, that the Labour movement, as far as its operations are directed towards converting such surplus income into wages, will exercise a wholly beneficial effect. It is obvious, however, that such action involves both intelligence and training on the part of the leaders of the Labour movement, and is quite incompatible with its abandonment to leaders of such small intelligence as to be seduced by the plausible imbecilities of the various Socialistic ideals.

The land taxation of a recent Budget affords

a striking example of the failure to recognise the conditions of production as set forth in Chapter III. Without attempting a detailed criticism, I will illustrate this by an example. We have seen that rent is in all cases a portion of the surplus product. It is also easily identified, and cannot be evaded. We have seen, however, that the land forming the basis for rent is simply a form of capital, and it is contrary to every principle of justice to tax special portions of the surplus product more heavily than others, simply because it happens to be easier for the framer of the Budget to get at them. Moreover, in the case of the land taxes, as in other portions of the Budget, no serious attempt was made to confine the taxation to what we have called surplus income. Instead of falling mainly on those most capable of bearing it, the main incidence of the burden was upon the narrow incomes of the workmen and small proprietors.

Hobson points out (p. 221) that the doctrine of the *single taxer*, who desires to levy all taxation upon land, arises from too narrow an interpretation of the unproductive surplus available for the necessary public income and for division amongst the different factors of production. He also observes that—

"Socialism has done as much to blur a clear conception by a doctrine of surplus value which includes not merely all rent, but all interest and profit as well. Confusing the economics of a hypothetical society, in which the State, owning all the instruments of industry, need no longer take into account the categories of rent, interest, or profit, with the economic analysis of current industry, Karl Marx regarded payments for mental and manual labour as the only legitimate expenses, pooling rent, interest, profit, and a large part of salaries as surplus wrung by the exploiting classes from the workers who were the sole producers of income. The rejection of this interpretation by most reasonable persons, and the resentment felt at the refusal of Socialists to recognise the actual industrial services rendered by saving and the direction of industry, and the validity of some interest and profit in payment for these services, has discredited the conception of a 'surplus' as much in one way as the narrow single tax doctrine in another. For purposes of a taxing policy, the surplus value of 'orthodox' Socialism is invalid, because it refuses to recognise a minimum rate of interest and of profit as necessary to evoke the voluntary individual efforts of saving and of direction of industry. It would

defy the facts of existing society in the name of its vision of a future society."

Hobson insists further on the supreme significance in public finance of the "*unproductive surplus* or *unearned increment* in the meaning here given to it, including all sorts of scarcity gains. . . . Just as economic rent cannot shift a tax once placed or settled on it, so with every other unearned element of income. The tax cannot be shifted, because the existence of an unearned income, not being an incentive to the application of the land, capital, or ability from which it is derived, the imposition of the tax will cause no withdrawal of the supply, and therefore no raising of the price."

This applies just as much to higher interest, or profits, or wages of ability, than are sufficient to bring the requisite capital or ability into operation, as it does to economic rent. As Hobson further points out, the distinction between the inelastic costs of industry and the elastic residue which has been called *unproductive surplus*, in order to distinguish between absolutely necessary returns, and the excess beyond absolute necessity, does not in any way imply that "the State is entitled to absorb by taxation, or otherwise, the whole of this surplus, on the ground that society has created it, needs

it, and intends to utilise it for social expenditure." It is, however, to the elastic portion and not to the necessary costs that "the individual must look for his wage of progress, and the State for its entire income, including both its wear and tear fund, and its wage of progress." Not only would it be contrary to the principles both of justice and expediency for the State to absorb the *entire* surplus; these principles would be infringed if anything more were taken by the State than is absolutely requisite for the maintenance of the State and for serviceable progress.

"A city or State might easily become a reckless spendthrift if it took more *surplus* than it could digest, as many a parasitic instance testifies in history. The claims of the individual producers and of society, in the form of the State, upon the true surplus, must then be set upon a level, to be adjusted in accordance with a wise interpretation of their respective capacities of growth, and of the needs implied in these capacities."

I can only give a brief consideration to the question of Socialism in Local Government, referring the reader who desires further information on the subject to Mr. Towler's admirable and inexpensive volume with that title.

In addition to the revenue derived from taxation, it has been for centuries the practice of States and Municipalities to obtain income from the public operation of certain industries, usually confined to large industries, engaged in supplying goods or services for the needs of the whole, or the greater part, of the community, and which, if left to private enterprise, tend to become strong monopolies. These are types of industry in which large surplus profit is obtainable, and if they could be carried on efficiently by public departments, their public operation would be of advantage, by securing this surplus for the benefit of the whole community instead of only a portion of it, provided always that it did not give rise to other evils sufficient to counterbalance such advantage. Even if there were no incidental objections, and the State or Municipal operations were as highly efficient as the experience of centuries has shown them to be inefficient, with very few exceptions, which are found only in the case of comparatively small communities, it would be contrary to the principles of government arrived at in Chapter X., and fatal to individual liberty, if extended indiscriminately. It is only in the case of business operations which could not be efficiently carried out

by private enterprise, or which, if left to such enterprise, would tend to become oppressive monopolies, that public operation can even be entertained as a possibility, in accordance with the principles there shown to be valid.

An important objection to State or Municipal trading is its unprogressive character. It is not to the interest of the officials to adopt improved appliances or methods, even when these have been well tried under private enterprise, for their adoption involves much additional trouble without any corresponding remuneration. The adoption of promising but untried improvements is almost unknown, for the officials can obtain no advantage in the case of success, and are liable to blame in the event of failure. Wasteful extravagance is also an almost universal feature, and corruption a common one.

The great incidental danger, however, in all such operation, if at all of an extensive character, relatively to the size of the community, is, in the case of democratic communities, the pressure which can be exerted upon the State or Municipality by the voting power of its servants. In some of the Australasian governments it has already been found necessary to provide against such pressure by placing

limitations upon the franchise of these servants. Such pressure is invariably exerted primarily in obtaining, for the servants of the State or Municipality, higher wages or other advantages, in comparison with those obtainable by other workers; and all such benefits are necessarily obtained mainly at the expense of other workers. Assuming the provision of satisfactory safeguards against this danger, the public operation of industries, within these strictly defined limits, will be permissible, provided the management be conducted in such manner as to produce a greater return to the State or Municipality, in the shape of surplus profit after full allowance for all costs of maintenance and growth, than could be derived by leasing the monopoly to private undertakers under such regulative safeguards as might be necessary for the public welfare. Since such public operation as we have here limited and defined has been shown to be compatible with the fundamental principles of government, it can in no case be considered as State, or Municipal, Socialism. The aims of the Socialists, however, is to extend such operation beyond these limits, in order to pave the way for experimenting, at the public expense, with their wild and irrational theories. It has therefore long been their policy, and especially

that of the Fabian Society, unobtrusively to promote all such schemes of municipal operation of industries, quite irrespective of whether the result be a gain or a loss. In order to cover up the evidence of loss incurred in this manner, they show untiring energy in raising every possible obstacle to the proper investigation and auditing of the accounts of municipal undertakings, and endeavour to introduce confusion, by what can only be described as *faking* the accounts. Even with the unsatisfactory methods of accounting now in vogue it can, I think, be shown beyond the possibility of question that the great majority of municipal undertakings are carried on at a loss to the community, in spite of the profits which they manage to produce on paper by manipulation of the accounts.

There are certain exceptions to this, and some noteworthy ones, and in all these cases it will, I think, be found that the municipality in question has succeeded in obtaining a management of able business men willing to devote the same time and care to the public service as they would give to a private enterprise under their control.

PART II

THE PSEUDO-PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF SOCIALISM AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL FEATURES OF THE MARXIAN THEORY OF SOCIALISM

THE basis of the whole structure which Socialists call "*Scientific Socialism*" is the essentially atheistic pseudo-philosophical system known as Materialism. Upon this foundation Marx erects, by means of transparently fallacious economic reasoning, the ground floor of his economic structure, his Theory of Exchange Value. The first floor, the Marxian hypothesis of surplus value as the sole origin and mode of growth of capital, rests on, and derives its support from, the Theory of Exchange Value, and, as I have shown, fresh economic fallacies are introduced in the course of its derivation. The second floor, the doctrine of the "class war," that is to say, of an inherently necessary antagonism between the proletariat, or labouring class, and the rest of the community, although in itself demonstrably false, is the logical outcome of the Marxian hypothesis of the origin and growth of capital.

The whole structure is therefore nothing more than a house of painted cardboard built upon the shifting sand. The weakness of practically every part has been recognised by individual Socialists, and one has tried to improve one portion and another to improve some other portion, but the results have only been to produce structures even more obviously unstable than the original.

I have pointed out elsewhere[1] that the great German philosopher Kant definitely proved that existence can only mean existence for consciousness, existence unrelated to a conscious self being a mere empty abstraction. He did not, however, succeed in accounting for the apparent antagonism between mind and matter, and it was reserved for Hegel to indicate the nature of the solution, the unification of both in terms of a self-determining Being, the Eternal Self-Consciousness, whose primary manifestation I have called, in the work referred to, The Universal Mind.

As Ramsay MacDonald[2] observes: "Marx rejected Hegel's Idealism, but he retained the

[1] *A Treatise on Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe*, p. 499. This will be referred to hereafter under the shorter title, *Problem of the Universe.*

[2] *Socialism and Society*, p. 111.

Hegelian notion of how the Idea evolved itself." Marx tells us himself:[1] "My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, *i.e.* the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea,' he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea.' With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." On the same page, referring to Hegel's dialectic, he writes: "With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell." That is to say, the Hegelian dialectic, adapted to a conception of the world in which mind is the ultimate reality, and matter is regarded as a manifestation of mind, and subordinate to it, was stood on its head, or inverted, in the attempt to apply it to a world-conception in which matter is considered to be the sole ultimate reality, of which mind is a mere product. Ramsay MacDonald[2] is

[1] *Capital*, 4th edition, p. 30 (Preface to 2nd edition).
[2] *Socialism and Society*, p. 112.

perfectly justified in his contention that in this form the Hegelian dialectic "describes superficial appearances rather than explains deep-seated causes. It would, for instance, explain what goes on in the hedgerows in spring as an opposition between the bud and the enveloping sheaths; it would leave out of account the great stirring up of life from deepest root to highest branch tip, of which the opposition between bud and sheath is but a small—if dramatic and easily seen—incident. For this reason, it cannot be dissociated from the idea of catastrophe and revolution, of accumulated energy bursting through opposition, of a simplicity of opposing forces which is never found in the actual world." Marx explains his standpoint more fully in his *Criticism on Political Economy*, an earlier work than the better known *Capital*. Ferri[1] summarises Marx's standpoint, as set forth in the former work, in the following terms: "The generations which preceded us have been imbued with this idea of absolute natural laws struggling in the dualism of matter and mind. Positive Science,[2] on the

[1] *Socialism and Positive Science*, p. 81.

[2] Positive Science is the so-called scientific scheme of Auguste Comte. Ferri (p. 67) defines it as that "which denies the free will of man and sees in human activity, individual and

contrary, starts from the grand synthesis of Monism, that is to say, of the sole phenomenal reality, matter and force[1] being recognised as inseparable and indestructible, developing themselves in a continued movement, assuming successively forms relative to time and place. . . . Morality, law, politics, are only superstructures—effects of the economic structure. They vary with it from one clime to another, from one century to another century." On p. 144 he writes: "There have been given in the history of mankind, leaving apart the two anti-scientific explanations of free-will and Divine Providence, two explanations, one-sided, and in consequence incomplete, although positive and scientific. I mean the *physical determinism* of Montesquieu, Buckle, and Metschnikoff, and the *anthropological determinism* of ethnologists who see in the organic and physical characteristics of races the historic reason for events. Karl Marx resumes and completes these two theories by his economic determinism. The economic conditions—which are the resultant of the energies and

collective, a necessary effect, determined at the same time by conditions of race and environment.

[1] If Professor Ferri had any knowledge of physical science he would replace the term *force* by *energy*, the former being meaningless in this connection.

ethnological aptitudes acting in a given physical environment—are the determinative basis of all moral, juridical, and political manifestations of human, individual, and social life."

It is clear that such a view of the world is incompatible with any form of religious belief. It is compatible only with Atheism, or the Atheistic Pantheism in which the word God is considered as merely an expression for the sum total of matter and energy in the universe. This was fully recognised by Marx, who wrote, in *The Secret Societies of Switzerland:* "We make war against all prevailing ideas of religion, of the State, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keystone of a perverted civilisation. It must be destroyed. The true root of liberty, of equality, of culture, is Atheism." This materialistic determinism is, moreover, scientifically and philosophically impossible, besides being in direct contradiction to everyday experience. Although it has so completely disappeared from the world of thought that no thinker could now be found to champion it, it is spreading amongst the uneducated and semi-educated. A full muster of the principal arguments against it, though slaying it many times over, must therefore not be considered unnecessary.

This I shall endeavour to present in the next chapter, but before doing so it will be of interest briefly to consider the nature of the causes which led to a mind so acute as that of Marx becoming entangled in such a maze of self-contradictions as I have unravelled, as far as was requisite for this purpose, in Part I. of this volume. Merely viewing his life from the surface, we see that, at the time he evolved his system, he was full of a just indignation against the abuses of the industrial system at a time when the doctrines of what was known as the *Manchester School* held almost undisputed sway in the field of economics. This was the school which aroused the righteous indignation of Charles Kingsley and his colleagues, whose opposition to this soulless, utterly non-ethical conception of society was known as Christian Socialism. Modern Socialism, which is based upon conceptions as essentially non-ethical as the Manchester School of Economics, and is therefore fundamentally opposed to the Christian Socialism of Maurice and Kingsley, has greatly profited by the application of the same name to these absolutely incompatible ideas. Marx was at one with the Christian Socialists in his detestation of the Manchester School, and all his competent

critics are agreed that his exposure of its abominations is the one and only element of permanent value in his work. This exposure was a good work and a great work, and those whose judgment is guided by competent reasoning power may have every whit as much sympathy with it as those whose lack of reasoning power prevents them from discerning his errors.

In the second place, Marx, at the time he evolved his system, was an exile from his country and in bitter revolt against all authority, so that his mind was in the emotional condition which would lead him to grasp at any conceivable possibility of overturning the authority against which he was in revolt. When these facts are considered in relation to Marx's early training and the various influences and associations brought to bear upon him, it becomes easy to understand how his system was built up, and how he became entangled in contradictions from which he was unable to liberate himself. In what follows I am greatly indebted to Dr. Hammacher, whose profound analysis of the genesis and development of Marxism,[1] which was published in 1909, only came to

[1] *Das philosophisch-ökonomische System des Marxismus.*

my knowledge after most of the present volume was in type, and also to two articles on Socialism in *The Quarterly Review* of April and July 1910. We have already seen that Marx founded his system upon an attempted inversion of the philosophy of Hegel, which he had studied deeply in his early manhood. It was from Hegel that he derived the view of history as a process of development, every stage in which consisted in the resolution of two opposing principles into a higher unity. He and his friend Friedrich Engels, with whom he was so closely associated that it is not always possible to disentangle their respective contributions to the system known as Marxism, subsequently came under the influence, first of Feuerbach, and then of French materialistic thinkers, and became thoroughly imbued with that pseudo-philosophic system. They therefore attempted to adapt Hegel's dialectic to a purely materialistic view of history, according to which Mind, being regarded as a mere by-product of Matter, might be left out of account, and the whole course of human progress considered as determined only by economic conditions.

Dr. Hammacher's exhaustive analysis shows conclusively how this misapplication of Hegel's

dialectic involved Marx again and again in an inextricable web of difficulties, and, as far as I can judge from a comparatively cursory study of his great work, extending to over 700 pages, I think he establishes his contention that the masses of involved verbiage which, in Chapters I. and II., we found it necessary to clear out of the way, arose in every case from his attempts to extricate himself from the maze of contradictions in which his philosophical procedure had involved him. I have not, however, thought it advisable on that account to make any alterations in the earlier chapters. Dr. Hammacher's lengthy and profound investigations confirm my own simple direct analysis at every point, and the doubts which I sometimes expressed as to whether Marx were really in the state of mental fog indicated by his words, or whether he might not have raised the fog intentionally in order to bewilder his readers, were such as would almost inevitably arise in the mind of any critic who had not traced these extraordinary performances to their source by a detailed analysis of the devious wanderings of Marx's mind. Dr. Hammacher, in accomplishing this task, has completely and for ever destroyed the pretensions of Marxism to rank as in any

sense a scientific scheme; but I think I am justified in the opinion that in doing this he has triumphantly established Marx's honesty of purpose.

It would be entirely out of place in this volume to attempt to follow Dr. Hammacher in any part of his able and exhaustive analysis, for even if space were available, it would appeal only to minds of more than a little philosophical training. The source of one of Marx's most fundamental errors is, however, immediately obvious — that is to say, his assumption that labour, mental and manual, may be expressed in terms of manual labour only, or more simply, as I explained in Chapter I., p. 13, in terms of mechanical work only. The practical absurdity of this was demonstrated in that chapter. It is, however, a necessary consequence of Marx's materialism, for, according to this view, directivity has no real existence. The skilled engineer and the navvy are both mechanical dolls, mere puppets, entirely controlled by their environment, and entirely without initiative. There is, therefore, on the materialist view, no more fundamental difference between the navvy and the engineer than exists between two puppets in a marionette show, one of which is dressed

to resemble a king and the other clothed as a peasant. Their actions might be interchanged by the puller of the strings.

It was with this mental equipment that Marx came in contact with the Socialists of France and of England, and *The Quarterly Review* observes: "The extent of the pre-eminent influence he has exercised lies not in any originality, but in the fact that he united three streams of thought—the German metaphysical, the French political revolutionary, and the English economic." He was largely influenced by the French Socialist, Proudhon, and by English Socialists whom he afterwards met in London. *The Quarterly Review* points out that English Socialism derived its origin from Godwin's *Political Justice*, published in 1793; that his ideas were taken up by Charles Hall, a medical man, in 1805, and further developed by the writers Thompson, Hodgskin, Edwards, and Gray[1] some twenty years later; while, in 1831, William Carpenter, in his principles of *Social Economy*, formulated a number of propositions which approach the standpoint of modern Socialism much more closely than the Communist

[1] See *The Right to the Whole Produce of Labour*, by Dr. Anton Menger, with introduction by Prof. H. S. Foxwell.

manifesto of Marx and Engels, which was drawn up in 1847–48.

It was under these influences that Marx studied such economists as Ricardo and Rodbertus, exaggerated the errors of their defective analysis, and built up from their systems, combined with the Socialistic teachings he had imbibed from various sources, what appeared to the superficial observer to be a consistent scheme. The elements were not due to Marx, who did not even attempt to test them by comparison with observation, the first essential to a scientific system. He does not appear ever to have been inside one of the factories about which he wrote. He simply fitted assumed facts and arguments into the abstract and fundamentally erroneous conception with which he started. It is not surprising, therefore, that a system constructed in this manner should lead to Collectivist economics characterised by Prof. Albert Schatz[1] in the following powerful passage quoted in *The Quarterly Review* (July 1910):—

"Driven from their own field, miracles have taken refuge in political economy. You will hear it said, as a perfectly natural thing, that by working less you gain more; that by

[1] *L'Individualisme économique et social.*

producing dearer you can sell cheaper; that by paralysing initiative you form strong wills, well-seasoned minds, and powerful nations; that by entrusting affairs to incapable hands you secure good administration; that by promising the people to give them the moon you show a sincere love for them; that with poor individuals you make a rich society; that by disorganising the whole of which we are part you work usefully to make us happy."

CHAPTER VIII

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF MATERIALISTIC DETERMINISM[1]

THE hypothesis of materialism may be expressed most simply in the statement :—

Matter and motion are the only realities in the universe, and mind has no independent existence of its own.

Some Materialists have asserted that mind is simply secreted by the brain, just as bile is secreted by the liver. Others, for whom such a conception is altogether too gross, and obviously absurd, take refuge in the vagueness of stating that mind is a product of matter, or that mind is potentially inherent in matter.

Deferring for a moment the criticism of this initial hypothesis, it clearly does not, in itself, provide for the observed ordered scheme of nature. The Materialist, therefore, introduces

[1] *Materialistic Determinism* is simply the hypothesis formed by the conjunction of the hypothesis of *necessity* with that of *materialism.*

the further hypothesis that the motions of this matter take place in accordance with unalterable, or necessary, laws. He does not admit that this is a mere hypothesis, but claims that it is a legitimate conclusion from experience, an absolutely unjustifiable claim. What we call, for brevity, natural laws, are nothing more than generalised expressions of the results of our very limited experience, expressions of our belief that our past experiences *will* be repeated in the future. The Materialist changes *will* into *must*, which is nothing else than the personification of natural law, one of the worst of pseudo-scientific absurdities. Having excluded the regulative action of mind, which is essential to an ordered scheme of nature, he reintroduces it surreptitiously in the illegitimate form of personified law, which is thereby practically represented as a kind of deity, and imagines that in this manner he has eliminated the lawgiver whose existence is a necessary implication of the existence of law. As Huxley has written:[1] "If it is certain that we can have no knowledge of the nature of either matter or spirit, and that the notion of

[1] "Physical Basis of Life," *Lay Sermons*, pp. 124, 125. See also *Problem of the Universe*, pp. 461–462.

necessity is something illegitimately thrust into the perfectly legitimate conception of law, the materialistic position that there is nothing in the world but matter, force, and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of theological dogmas."

The Materialist evades the necessity of accounting for the creation and building up of the universe, in the absence of creative and directive intelligence, by the further assumption that the universe is eternal. He assumes that the changes and interchanges observed and revealed by scientific research form part of an eternal process which always has been, and always will be. As Ramsay MacDonald writes in his preface to the English translation of Ferri's *Socialism and Positive Science:* "It may be true logically, as Ferri asserts, that once the evolutionary process is granted, it is as easy to swallow the gnat of eternal and self-existent force and matter, as it is to swallow the camel of an eternal and self-existent God."

This assumption is, however, absolutely inconsistent with the conclusions of modern physical science. I have demonstrated elsewhere[1] that the eternal existence of a universe

[1] *Problem of the Universe*, pp. 235, 413, 449, 560.

containing molecularly-constituted matter is possible only under the control of purposive intelligence. It is there proved that the eternal existence of such a universe is, in the absence of continuous intelligent control, of mathematically infinite improbability. It is also proved that such control is perfectly consistent with dynamical laws, and therefore with the observed laws of nature. It is shown, moreover, that control of precisely similar character, although on a much smaller scale, is exercised by every living being known to us, the amount of such control increasing with the intelligence of the living agent. The exercise of such control is therefore ascertainable by ordinary observation. As a simple illustration of the cogency of the demonstration, I have pointed out[1] that the process employed in the investigation of the possibility of the eternal existence of the universe, subject only to dynamical laws, that is to say, in the absence of intelligent directive control, may be applied to the investigation of the comparatively simple dynamical system consisting of a kettle of water placed on a fire. It may be shown in this way that it is infinitely improbable, although theoretically possible without the infringement of any

[1] *Problem of the Universe*, p. 450.

known dynamical law, that the water should freeze instead of boiling. A comparison of the two cases shows that the possibility of the water freezing instead of boiling is greater than the possibility of the eternal existence of an uncontrolled universe. The Materialist is therefore driven back upon the alternative of a universe which has had a beginning in time, and is running down to a state of physical death, in which no further change is possible. Moreover, the same investigation which shows that the universe cannot be eternally self-existent, shows that the initial conditions could not arise spontaneously from pre-existing conditions of matter in motion in accordance with the observed laws of nature. I have, however, proved [1] that the same intelligent controlling power which would be capable of maintaining the universe in eternal existence, would be sufficient to account for the establishment of the initial conditions. This argument is, in itself, absolutely destructive of the materialistic position. The advent of life, according to the Materialists, consists in nothing else than an increase in the complexity of motion of the matter forming what Huxley has called the *physical basis of life*,

[1] *Problem of the Universe*, chap. xxiii.

or *protoplasm*. If this were so, it might be supposed that there would be no insuperable difficulty in discovering the conditions necessary for the transformation of non-living into living matter, and even making it possible for the experimenter to effect the transformation of non-living matter into living beings. Innumerable attempts have been made to demonstrate the possibility of such a transformation, but every one has been a complete failure. Tyndall wrote in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1878: "I affirm that no trustworthy shred of experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life." His statement is still as indisputably true as when it was made. The Materialist is therefore reduced to the alternative of assuming, in spite of the negative evidence, that spontaneous generation *must* have occurred at some time or another, or that life has always existed in an eternal universe. We have seen, however, that an eternal universe is an impossibility in the absence of the directive intelligence which the Materialist assumes to be non-existent. Even if this impossibility could be evaded, the advocate of the eternal existence of living matter as

accounting for the presence of life on our earth would find himself compelled to select one of two further assumptions of the most improbable character. He must either assume that living matter was capable of existing in the fire-mist stage through which the earth and the other bodies of our solar system have passed, or he must assume that germs of life are capable of transmission across interstellar spaces too vast for the utmost stretch of our imagination to succeed in picturing them.

So far we have considered the materialistic presentation only in so far as it deals with inanimate nature, and have seen that it offers no solution whatever of the advent of life. We have not yet considered what account it can give of the nature of life and living beings. When this is done, the observer can no longer look upon the world as simply a picture which has no immediate relation to himself. It then becomes a picture in which he has to find a place for himself. When we reach this stage we find that it is not merely a badly drawn picture. The whole picture fades into a mist of intangible shadows. We find, not merely that materialism is scientifically untenable, not merely that it is an erroneous

system built up of guesses unsupported by experience and unguided by scientific insight. We find that, in the words of Sir Leslie Stephen's well-known criticism, "It is not so much an error as an absurdity."

In dealing with the phenomena of life as presented by materialistic determinism, it is impossible to maintain a self-consistent attitude unless it be continuously borne in mind that the picture is a purely objective one, in which there is no place for the thinking subject, whether this be the writer or the reader. I shall therefore describe the picture as it appears to me, looking at it from outside, as a representation of a world in which I have no place, like a moving panorama of scenes from some unfamiliar land. I ask the reader, as he follows my words, to imagine himself in my place, and to gaze on the same panorama as one in which he neither has nor can have part. I must first, however, remind him that, according to materialistic determinism, there is nothing in any one of these pictures but matter and motion, and that every action of every part was determined millions of years ago, when the earth was a seething mass of molten rock; and millions of years earlier still, when the whole matter of our solar system was a nebulous

mist extending through inconceivable immensities of space. I will suppose that a learned materialistic friend stands at my elbow, ready to afford such explanations of the world of materialistic determinism as my benighted condition as an inhabitant of the world of purposive action, the world of science and common sense, may call for.

I cast out of my mind, for the time, the scientific objections already considered. I accept, as a provisional working hypothesis, the assumption that the universe consists only of matter in motion in obedience to fixed laws, although I fully recognise that the existence of fixed laws without a lawgiver to fix them must necessarily be a pure assumption, so that from this point of view alone, the materialistic hypothesis could never become a complete and satisfying theory of the world. Picture after picture passes before my view. I recognise the successive phases of the earth's history, as revealed by the researches of astronomy, physics, and geology, and as yet no further difficulty is introduced. Then there appears that most lowly of all recognised living organisms, the Moneron,[1] consisting of a single cell, without nucleus or integument, a mere

[1] See *Problem of the Universe*, p. 477.

globular mass of slime. As I watch it, I see portions of the mass projected in all directions in the form of minute tentacles. One of these comes in contact with a tiny particle of flint, which slightly deflects the tentacle, but gives rise to no further result. Another tentacle comes in contact with a minute living creature. The latter is instantly surrounded by a network of tentacles thrown out from the primary ones in its vicinity, and the creature is drawn into the interior of the Moneron, which resumes its globular shape. I watch the smaller creature slowly dissolving, and its substance permeating that of the Moneron. I remark to my friend that here is evidently purposive action. The creature feels the urge of hunger, and is able to distinguish between foodstuffs and inert particles. How do you account for it? His reply is that this purposive action is the first beginning of mind in its most elementary form, and that it *must* be secreted within the structure of the Moneron. I do not like the expression *must be*. When it is employed by a learned professor it nearly always corresponds to the favourite formula of the insufficiently prepared examinee, and simply means I don't know how to prove. I have two objections to raise. In the first place, it is impossible, under the highest

microscopical power, to detect any trace of structure in the Moneron. In the second place, purposive action is something entirely unknown in inanimate matter, its presence in which would be inconsistent with the observed Newtonian laws of motion, which form the foundation of dynamics. How could anything of such an entirely new order as purposive action possibly arise out of any mere increase in the complexity of motion of the particles of matter? His answer to the first objection is that there *must be* some structure, as otherwise there would be no way of accounting for the secretion. This structure *might be* of atomic dimensions, and therefore below the reach of microscopic observation. As to why this secretion, if it existed, should possess this entirely new property, he could only acknowledge that it was a mystery. Materialism has no better answers to give, and they are obviously no answers at all.

I next watched a seriesof pictures representing purposive action in various kinds of plants, and its steady increase in the ever-ascending stages of animal development, ultimately becoming conscious. I asked my friend how he would account for purposive action becoming consciously directed. He pulled me up at once,

and declared that consciousness has no directive power. Purposive action, he maintained, whether manifested in connection with the Moneron or in connection with the consciousness of the ablest engineer, or scientific thinker, or philosopher, is, like all other action, entirely determined by the pre-existing physical conditions. Consciousness is nothing but a mirror in which the material world is reflected and transformed into thought (see quotation from Karl Marx, p. 247, *ante*). The appearance of consciousness he could not account for; it was another mystery. It certainly, he declared, does not give men or animals any control over their surroundings. They are, on the contrary, entirely controlled by their surroundings. The ablest of mankind are nothing more than chips of wood tossed upon the angry waves, except that they know that they are being tossed, and imagine that they can exercise some small control over the tossing. This is, however, merely an illusion. Then, I replied, if I were to strike you in the face, it would be just as unreasonable for you to feel angry with me, and strike me in return, as if you were to destroy a valuable rose bush in anger at pricking your finger with one of its thorns. He declared that I was perfectly right in my

conclusions; and when I asked him if he always acted upon these principles, he showed some annoyance, and asked me if I knew anybody who always regulated his actions by strict logic. Materialistic determinism is simply absolute fatalism, but I have never heard of a Materialist, outside of a lunatic asylum, who attempted logically to carry out his principles in the details of his daily life.

One more picture arrested my attention; it was simply a litter of three puppies, all differently marked. I asked my friend, how do you account for the differences in the puppies? What possible differences could have existed in their physical antecedents or environment to account for the variation, since they were born of the same parents? His only reply was that if that question could be answered satisfactorily it would solve the greatest difficulty of the evolutionary theory. Finally, I asked him how he would account for the continuance of the sense of personal identity throughout the greater part of a long human life, in the course of which every material particle in the brain had been replaced several times over. He had, however, no reply to give.

I will now cease to look at the materialistic

representation of the world as something entirely outside myself, and try to connect myself with it, and, finally, to extend the picture in such a manner as to find a place for myself within it. To effect this, I must direct my attention inwards instead of outwards. I must ask myself this question: How do I become aware of the external picture to begin with? It then immediately becomes evident that the external world cannot possibly become known to me in any other way than in the form of pictures formed in my own mind. The whole world is, for me, as for every human being who has attained to the level of self-consciousness, divided primarily into two fundamental parts, the self and the not-self. As I have expressed it elsewhere:[1] "It is impossible to question the existence of the self. Theoretically, we may question the existence of the not-self or external world; that is to say, each one of us may ask himself the question: Am I the all, or is there something outside of myself? The question is, however, answered as soon as it is framed, for the limitations of the power of the self to order its own states of consciousness compel the belief in something outside of, and conditioning, the self. We may maintain, with

[1] *Problem of the Universe*, p. 466.

the pure Idealist, that there is no material external world, but we are then compelled to admit the existence of an external power which orders our states of consciousness as if there were an external world. That is to say, in order to avoid the hypothesis directly presented by consciousness as the interpretation of its states, we introduce it in another form."

We see therefore that the materialist hypothesis, although it appears at first sight plausible enough to the man who only looks outwards, who has never learned to turn his gaze inwards and reflect upon his own mind, is really a complete inversion of the actual facts. The Materialist is standing upon his head, although it seems to him, until he has attained sufficient intelligence to reflect, that he is standing on his feet. Matter in motion, therefore, instead of constituting the ultimate reality, is simply the hypothesis by which we co-ordinate and account for the facts of consciousness, that is to say, our mental states; or, as Huxley has expressed it:[1] "All the phenomena of nature are, in their ultimate analysis, known to us only as facts of consciousness."

Materialistic schemes (and any others which represent the universe as purposeless) are

[1] *Lay Sermons*, p. 296, or *Problem of the Universe*, p. 466.

essentially irrational; for they exclude reason from the universe, except for its introduction at a late stage in the evolution of life. They therefore represent reason as arising out of a system in which reason was not originally present. If reason were so developed by the Darwinian principle of *Natural Selection*, we should, as Mr. Balfour points out in *The Foundations of Belief*, have no grounds for assuming that it could possibly be of such a kind as to form a reliable guide, beyond assisting man in maintaining his physical existence. Natural selection could not be effective in developing reason for use in the higher regions of scientific and philosophical thought. The higher development of reason, therefore, if developed out of a state of unreason, would, on the purposeless hypothesis of the world, be unguided. Now there are more wrong ways than right ways in which it might develop under these circumstances. It would therefore be more likely to lead us astray than to direct us rightly.

It is not sufficient for our purpose to have demonstrated the impossibility and absurdity of the view of the world which forms the foundation of Marxian Socialism. The anti-socialist cannot rest satisfied with demonstrating the

rottenness of the foundations of the socialist theory of the state. He must know the nature of the foundations on which he himself takes his stand. He must first thoroughly satisfy himself of their solidity and absolute impregnability, and thereby qualify himself to demonstrate them to others. Finally, he must be able to show how the very nature of these foundations leads, of logical necessity, to the development of principles of state action which are absolutely destructive of socialistic theories in all their numerous forms.

CHAPTER IX

THE RATIONAL VIEW OF THE WORLD

ANY system in which the universe is presented as a purposeless system of unreason in which purposiveness, and ultimately reason, unaccountably appear somewhere and somewhen, on the earth, for example, at a comparatively late period of its history, can only be described as an irrational system. Such systems have, as we have seen, been propounded, and by thinkers of considerable ability, but never, in the history of thought, by a first-class thinker. The only view of the world which can be called a rational one is that in which the purpose and reason observed as now existing in it are presented as arising from the Eternal Purpose and Reason which alone can adequately account for their appearance in finite form. To the thinker of modern India, as to his forefathers of 4000 years ago, the authors of the Vedas, this Eternal Reason is the one present reality in comparison with which all

else is but as an illusion. From this starting-point, moreover, those ancient thinkers developed a physical theory of the world which, in its broad outlines, bears a startlingly close resemblance to the most recent developments of physical science, as set forth in my work on *The Problem of the Universe.* It is there described how the advance of electrical theory has led to the conception of material substance as built of atoms, each of which consists of a group of sub-atoms, or electrons, revolving in orbital motion about a central mass of electrons, while each electron is itself a distribution of strain, or strain-form, in the all-pervading ether, which is therefore the basis of all forms of matter. Optical and other electrical phenomena show that this primeval ether must be permeated throughout by energy [1] of spin of a complex type, the amount of this energy per unit of volume being everywhere the same. It is shown further (see p. 470), that the ascertained properties of the ether arise entirely from the presence of the energy, so that if this

[1] Energy is simply capacity of doing work, the energy of a physical system being the amount of work which would be obtained from the complete exhaustion of its energy. Such complete exhaustion is, however, a physical impossibility. It would involve the extinction of the phenomenal existence of the system.

could be removed there would remain nothing of which we could ascertain the presence by any conceivable means, that is to say, nothing having phenomenal existence. It follows, therefore, that energy is the sole ultimate phenomenal basis of matter; and therefore all interactions between mind and matter, as exhibited, for example, in the capacity possessed by the human mind of influencing, and being influenced by, external objects, find their ultimate expression in the form of interactions between mind and energy. If mind be defined as the entity which forms the basis of all the phenomena of consciousness in man and the higher animals, and of all those purposive actions which enable the lower as well as the higher forms to modify the relations between themselves and their material environment,[1] it follows that purposive action by living beings on inanimate matter consists in changes of energy distribution. Mind has therefore the power of directing energy. The definition of mind given above represents the distinction between living and non-living matter as consisting in the presence or absence of mind. Now all living matter,

[1] Herbert Spencer's criterion of life is a capacity for "the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations." *Principles of Biology*, vol. i. p. 74.

and living matter only, has the power of reproducing its kind, that is to say, of conferring life upon previously inanimate matter. Mind is therefore the giver of life. Again, we saw (p. 262, *ante*) that without intelligent guidance, the universe could not be eternally existent, and if running down from an initial state to a final state of quiescence, or physical death, this initial condition could not spontaneously arise from pre-existing conditions. This could, however, be effected by mind of sufficient intelligence, and possessing, to a sufficient degree, the power of guidance, that is to say, of altering the distribution of energy, and the powers necessary to such a mind would differ only in degree and not in kind from the observed powers of living beings. This naturally suggests, in the first place as a working hypothesis, the concept of an all-pervading *universal mind*, or omnipresent intelligence, forming an entity even more fundamental than the all-pervading ether, and having powers of a higher degree, but of the same kind, as the observed powers of living beings. I have shown that this assumption is all that is requisite to account for the building up of the universe of inanimate matter and the establishment of the observed laws of nature, starting only with the amount

of energy now present in the universe, distributed in any manner. It also accounts for the origin of life as the association with material bodies of units of mind proceeding from the universal mind, and therefore affords a complete explanation of all the phenomena described in connection with the Moneron. The variation in the markings of the puppies are fully accounted for by the building up of the embryos within the body of the mother under the guidance, though unaccompanied by consciousness, of the maternal mind. The advent of reason, and of the ethical faculties of mind, are accounted for by the increasing influx of mind from the universal mind, as the suitable bodily structure is attained in the course of development.

The physical nature of the argument affords only a limited presentation of the primal intelligence, but it is shown[1] that the relation established between mind and energy, together with the nature of physical causality in the light of our present knowledge, enables us to complete the argument by way of the Hegelian logic, and so to effect the complete rationalisation of the universe of mind and matter in terms of the Eternal Self-consciousness as

[1] *Problem of the Universe*, p. 498.

the self-existent, self-determined, and therefore infinite, Ultimate Reality. Reason, the highest principle of mind as we know it, is therefore shown to reign supreme throughout the universe, subject only to the possible existence of higher principles representing aspects of the Ultimate Reality which are beyond the reach either of our powers of observation or of our reason.

Every human mind is here presented as a finite manifestation of the Universal Mind, each with its own specific determination, giving it a certain independence, and enabling it to play a real, though limited, part in the control of nature. Every such unit of mind will be impelled by the very law of its being, which is the direct consequence of its derivation from the universal mind, to endeavour, as soon as it has risen to the stage of self-conscious reflection, to seek for, and endeavour to fulfil, this law. Its specific determination, expressing itself in and through the material environment of its own bodily structure, and the relations of that structure to the general material environment, constitutes the freedom of the individual, rising into personality as that freedom is realised.

In the earlier stages of the evolution of life

the impulse towards the fulfilment of the law of its being, which is experienced by every organism, is mainly external, the chief factor being the principle of the elimination of the unfit, generally known as the law of natural selection. Purposive action which, as we have seen, is exhibited even by the lowest organisms, becomes more and more predominant as the organism rises in the scale. With the advent of consciousness, pain, which is nature's warning signal indicative of the deviation of the organism from self-realisation in accordance with the law of its being, begins to play a part of steadily increasing importance. It is only in man, after he has reached the stage of reflective self-consciousness, that the fulfilment of the law of his being presents itself as an end to be consciously sought for. If we picture to ourselves the practical impossibility of a man existing apart from his fellows and from all other conscious life, the question of the elimination of evil could only present itself to him as the avoidance of pain, including its minor form of discomfort. Even, however, in such an imaginary case, the elimination of evil could only be effected by the fulfilment of the law of his being under these elementary conditions. Here evil is plainly seen to consist

simply in deviations from the law of his being. Evil is a necessary consequence of free-will in a world of progress. In a determinist world it would be unnecessary, and its existence in such a world would justify disbelief in an all-powerful, benevolent God. But in such a world men and all other living creatures could be nothing but automatic machines. If a benevolent outsider could gaze upon a determinist world of pain and suffering, he would be logically justified in desiring to eliminate evil by a change in the conditions, which could only be effected by external means. It would, however, be absolute foolishness for him to wonder why the automatic conscious machines in this world did not devise and establish such mechanism for themselves. He might wonder whether the whole complex mechanism were so constructed that the suffering would ultimately diminish or even be completely eliminated, but that this could be effected by conscious automata that were powerless to control even their own desires could only be suggested by a candidate for Bedlam.

If, however, the same outsider were gazing upon a world of free-will, such as our own has been shown to be, he would see two alternative methods, by either of which the suffering

might be diminished. The first would be to endeavour to accelerate the observed progress by promoting in every possible way the free development of personality, resulting in more complete self-realisation, and therefore more complete conformity to the law of his being, on the part of each individual. The second alternative, which would commend itself to a socialist onlooker, would be the imposition of an external regulative mechanism designed to diminish suffering by arresting the progress towards increased freedom through more perfect self-realisation, and reducing the individuals as far as possible to the state of automatic machines externally controlled. The anti-Socialist considers that even if such external ameliorative control were possible, the remedy would be worse than the disease. The clear thinker, whatever might be his prepossessions, would at once recognise the absolute impossibility of any such mechanical system being worked and controlled on any universal democratic basis, for the successful development of the system would involve a continuously increasing automatism, and therefore an increasing inability to exercise the requisite control on the part of the people growing up under it. The control would therefore necessarily pass into the hands of those

who had been least affected by the system, and this would result in an abrupt division between a ruling class and a ruled class. The more incompetent members of the ruling class, as the latter increased in numbers in the course of nature, would be driven across the dividing line into the ruled class. The subject class would, however, in consequence of the nature of their subjection, become increasingly differentiated from the ruling class, so that there would be no possibility of passing upwards across the dividing line.

These considerations will be found to provide a definite principle for the determination of the legitimate sphere of State action. In my treatment of this question I have been greatly indebted to Dr. S. S. Laurie's little work on *The Ethics of Reason*, and his larger, and far more difficult work, *Synthetica*. The latter is the one to which I am mainly indebted, having read it through quite recently coming across a review of it. I found it in such striking agreement with my own point of view, that it sent me, first to the earlier work first mentioned, and finally to his *Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta*, of which the first edition appeared in 1884, in order to discover how he had arrived at the view of the mind of man as a *finitisation of*

Mind-Universal, practically identical with my own view as set forth in the *Problem of the Universe*, twenty-six years later. I found that he had arrived at it by a purely metaphysical argument, of great depth and power, on the basis of an analysis of the phenomena of percipience, or knowing. My own argument[1] followed the much easier physical path, the last short step only, from the finite physical conception of the Universal Mind to the infinite Ultimate Reality, penetrating into the rarefied atmosphere of the metaphysician, in which most of us find it difficult to breathe with comfort for any lengthy period.

[1] This argument was developed in much greater detail than was possible in the present chapter in the first four of the author's recent Manchester lectures on *Modern Physics and Rational Ethics*. These lectures will be published very shortly after the issue of this volume.

CHAPTER X

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE

In the earlier stages of the life of man upon the earth, men appear to have aggregated, first into families, and then into larger communities, partly impelled thereto by considerations of defence against external enemies and by economic conditions, but, in all probability, still more strongly impelled by the gradual growth of the sympathy which lies at the base of the gregarious nature of man, and even of the lower animals. This sympathy is the development of the altruistic principle which appears at a very early stage in the evolution of life, in the form of parental care of offspring. If we trace the growth of the altruistic principle from its appearance up to its highest development in existing humanity, we find that its rate of growth increases relatively to that of the individualistic principle. Both, however, in healthy races, animal or human, must continue to grow. If the development of

individualism cease, retrogression begins, and the race disappears to make way for stronger ones.

It is only in a community that the altruistic principle can have scope for development, so that it is only in a community that man can fulfil the law of his being, and it is therefore in fulfilment of this law that men form themselves into communities. Man enters a community as a free-will, and carries his free-self, or personality, into the society which he forms, and is not, as socialists maintain, the product of the society. He does not surrender his personality, his right to the free development of his activities, mental, moral, and industrial. This right is an inherent one, which cannot be surrendered, for its basis is the law of man's being, and its surrender would involve a denial of the origin of this law in the Eternal Self-consciousness, that is to say, in God Himself, the origin and fount of all personality. It is, moreover, the only inherent right of man. The essential condition of its free development is that each man should respect the similar right of his fellows, for otherwise a return to savagery would be inevitable. The growth of sympathy which, in accordance with the law of man's being, must accompany progress in true

self-realisation, exhibits itself in the form of good-will to others and a desire for the good-will of others being expressed towards himself. This leads naturally to the growth of social co-operation which, if this term were not now appropriated to a special method of social co-operation, might well be called *Socialism*. I have called it *Sociality*. Socialism has now become a technical term applying only to those methods of attempting to carry sociality into practice which involve *the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange*. It is against the principles included or implied in this formula, both in their relation to the economic issue and to all the other issues of life and conduct, that the anti-socialist wages unrelenting war.

Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and Bishop Westcott, the first president of the Christian Social Union, were all strenuous advocates of sociality. Not one of them was a socialist, according to the now accepted meaning of the word, yet they all spoke of themselves as socialists, this being a term then applied to all advocates of social co-operation, or sociality. The Rev. James Adderley, in *The Parson in Socialism*, candidly admits (pp. 158 and 182) that neither Maurice, Kingsley, nor Westcott

was a socialist, but less honest socialists do not hesitate to make capital for their cause by claiming them as socialists. My own experience has been that the confusion of thought between sociality and socialism accounts for an enormously large proportion of those who call themselves socialists, and who support socialism by their votes. Mr. Adderley's book is from beginning to end an argument for sociality. All that he has to say for socialism is that he believes in the formula himself, and is a supporter of socialism and socialists. Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, in *Socialism and Society*, devotes some 190 pages to a very able argument in favour of sociality, which he calls socialism, while scarcely twenty pages are devoted to socialism itself. To compensate for this, the Independent Labour Party provides, in Ferri's *Socialism and Positive Science* (with a preface by the editor of the English edition, Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald), an excellent exposition of socialism as an agent for the destruction of religion, morality, and civilisation. On the constructive side, all that Professor Ferri has to tell us (p. 114) is that :—

"What scientific socialism can affirm, and what it does affirm with mathematical certainty, is that the current, the trajectory, of human

evolution is in a general sense indicated and foreseen by socialism, that is to say, in the sense of a continuous, progressive preponderance of the interests and benefit of the species over the individual—and consequently in the sense of a continuous socialisation of economic life, and through it, of juridical, moral, and political life. As to the small details of the new social edifice, we cannot foresee them precisely, because the new social edifice will be, and is, a natural and spontaneous product of human evolution which is already in the process of formation, general lines of which are already drawn and which is not an artificial construction imagined by some utopist or metaphysician."

It might be possible, by very judicious selection, to form a community which would, for a time, live together, on the simple basis of free individual development and mutual sociality, in complete harmony. It is, however, a matter of universal experience that no human community can continue its existence for any length of time without the introduction of discordant elements, arising from the weakness of some individuals and the selfishness of others. It then becomes necessary, in order to maintain harmony, in other words justice, in the community, to frame rules for its regulation. In

primitive communities these rules generally arose in the form of customs to which men felt their way, and at a later stage further rules were formulated, and customs modified, in the light of reason trained by experience. In order to ensure obedience to these rules it became necessary to formulate them with sanctions, that is to say, under penalties for their infringement, so converting the rules into laws, for a law is simply a rule formulated with a sanction. The primary purpose of law is therefore justice as a guarantee of individual freedom.

In the formulation of laws, as in all social progress, the individual is always in evidence. The aristocracy of mind, invariably confined to a few, provides the motive power, and from it all great ideas derive their origin, although the community may ultimately assimilate, and benefit by them.

The promulgation of laws involves a law-giver or sovereign who, as interpreting and formulating that general will which, at any given time, may be taken as representing the closest attainable approximation to the law of being of the community, is the origin of laws, the general will itself constituting their source. The general will may best be interpreted, according to the nature of the

community, by a single upright governor ruling, not for his own good, but for the general benefit; by an aristocratic or oligarchic council; or by an elected representative body. Legislation for the good of the sovereign, or of any special class, leads to social disorder, which may end in disruption, and this applies as much to a democratic majority as to an absolute sovereign. The ideal of Marxian socialism, based upon a class war and class legislation, is obviously in direct opposition to these principles.

Justice in its primary form, that of protecting the freedom of each individual from the encroachments of other individuals, Plato calls *negative justice*. Later on it becomes also *positive*, assisting the development of each individual. The laws against murder or theft are examples of *negative justice*, while *positive justice* is exemplified in sanitary and education laws. It is obvious that such a division is only one of general principle, and that no absolute line of demarcation can be drawn between these two forms of justice, when expressed in concrete form. On the Marxian view of society, as a series of units or particles held together by the pressure of external conditions, there would be no logical place for positive justice at all, nor any tendency for justice to pass beyond its

limits in the name of benevolence or philanthropy. The only question that could possibly present itself would be, as Dr. Laurie[1] expresses it, What is the *least* I can do for others in order to have free scope for my own desires? On the basis of the rational view of the world, on the other hand, the State must clearly be regarded, not as a machine minded by a policeman with authority behind him, but as an ethical organisation. The community, and therefore its governing executive, the State, is, like the individual and the universe in which he finds himself, instinct with purpose. The State contains within it from the first the ideal of harmony or justice. The obligation of the State to assist those unable to realise themselves must therefore be governed by the same general considerations as determine the corresponding duty of the individual. And it is obviously my duty to help another towards his self-realisation to the extent of removing obstructions for which I am directly or indirectly responsible. The State may be regarded as simply a greater and more powerful man than any single member of the community. And it cannot be disputed that there are many evils which arise as by-products, or unforeseen

[1] *Ethics of Reason*, p. 182.

results, generated by the very organisation of civilised communities, together with the great benefits which such organisation confers on the community as a whole. It is clearly the duty of the State to remedy such unfortunate results of negative justice by removing obstructions, so arising, to the self-realisation of portions of the community. The Factory Acts, Truck Acts, Poor-law legislation, and the education of the people, afford familiar examples. As Dr. Laurie very well expresses it :[1] "The end and idea of the whole organisation is justice, positive as well as negative, and to permit the continuance of unjust relations among the citizens under the protection of physical force, is for the State to forego the very purpose of its existence, and to use its might in defiance of right. So soon as the public conscience is awakened to the existence of unjust relations among men, the State is under the obligation to go as far in alleviating the conditions of life as the public conscience will let it go." The limits to which it is legitimate to extend such actions are determined, for the State and for the individual, by the same fundamental considerations. The ethical purpose of man is free self-realisation, freedom to seek the law

[1] *Ethics of Reason*, p. 204.

of his being, and freedom for the expression of his spontaneous activity under that law. It follows, therefore, that the State, like the individual, may provide opportunities and guidance for the individual citizens where requisite. It is not, however, legitimate for either to do for any man what he can do for himself; for such action would be, not helpful, but harmful to the individual in question, and if carried out generally, would be injurious to the ethical development of the community.

The Socialist conception of the State, in the mechanical society imagined by Marx and his followers, is derived by a curiously illogical process. In such a society, as already pointed out, the State may be represented as a machine minded by a policeman, and it is clear that under such a system the whole of social ethics must necessarily be reduced to the one virtue of obedience. This machine is then represented as an organism of such a kind that the laws of its action can be arrived at without any study of its constituent parts, the individuals of the community, and cannot be deduced from the character of these individuals. Then, as Dr. Laurie observes :[1] "The 'organism,' it seems, finds certain kinds of acts useful to itself and

[1] *Ethics of Reason*, p. 209.

suited to its environment, and so there gradually emerges a system of such useful acts and of the corresponding motive forces within men —the particles of the organism. These motive forces constitute the ethics of the individual as they do of the organism, working themselves, in the course of the ages, into the individual from the outside. The object makes the subject." The danger of such a conception lies in the fact of its reducing social ethics to mere obedience. If a community could be brought to accept this conception, it would be prepared for slavish submission to any individual, or group of individuals, that might succeed in obtaining control of the machine, for it is obvious that the machine could not control itself. The consequences are so well set forth by Dr. Laurie,[1] that I shall quote him again: "A State collectivism, accordingly, in which the unqualified conception of an 'organism' logically lands us, by restraining the free activity of each self-conscious personality, strikes not only at the liberty of the citizen in the vulgar acceptance of the term 'liberty,' but cuts off at the fountain-head the spring of the entire spiritual life of man. It is profoundly immoral; for with free activity must

[1] *Ethics of Reason*, p. 220.

perish all that distinguishes man from animal, and all must go in religion, philosophy, literature, and art by which human life has been exalted and dignified. If these things still hold a place in the life of the race, it would be as a dim tradition of happier epochs. It has not been the race as a collective body which has created literature, and art, and religion—no, not even political institutions and laws—but great personalities, in presence of whose genius the mass bowed the head in submission or acquiescence. An organised and consistent collectivism would, like an absolute paternal despotism, be the grave of distinctive humanity." We saw in Chapter V. that, with the exception of vainly retaining a place for art, this exactly represents the ideal Socialist state of the future as pictured in William Morris's dream, *News from Nowhere*. We saw also that this ideal is the admitted aim of a very active and energetic, if somewhat unintellectual, group of socialists.

A far more widely diffused Socialist ideal of the future is one in which man is to be all-in-all to himself, and all higher ideals are to be rejected as effete superstitions. It will be of interest to recall the opinion of one of the ablest scientific materialists of the last century,

Dr. Henry Maudsley. He actually believed such a future to be inevitable, but instead of regarding it as the paradise which the socialists claim, this is how he expressed himself: "And here one cannot help being somewhat disturbed by the question: To what larger whole than itself shall humanity have regard? Will it discover for itself a saving ideal in aspirations to do the service of a cosmical whole? Or will it be left finally without an ideal? When it comes to pass that humanity, fully constituted, is sensible of no vital relations to anything higher and larger than itself, and longs for no fuller life in the aim to attain a higher life outside itself, it will then have reached the term of its development and the beginning of the end. The impulse of evolution will have been exhausted in it.[1]

What an awful contemplation, that of the human race bereft of evolutional energy, disillusioned, without enthusiasm, without hope, without aspiration, without an ideal."

Many an able scientific thinker of the past century was oppressed with a similar brooding nightmare horror. I recall one, a friend of Professor Maudsley's and my own, and my teacher as well, and how often I heard

[1] *Body and Will*, pp. 193 and 323.

him express the sense of awful loneliness involved in feeling that the All-Father was dead, and looking out upon an empty heaven and a soulless earth. The very pathos of such heart-cries is enough to reveal not only the existence, but the nobility of the souls these men doubted, and redoubles our thankfulness that the onward march of science has for ever removed such fears from the mind of the scientific thinker of to-day. But still one hears the glib shallow-pate, whose mental outfit consists of scraps from the dust-heaps of discarded thought, propounding such doctrines as a gospel for the regeneration of humanity. One feels tempted to ask oneself whether such an one may not be a cast back to his anthropoid ancestry.

CHAPTER XI

REASON AND SUPERSTITION

We saw in Chapter X. that the rational view of the world not only leads to a definite concept of justice, but invests that concept with what we may call an *eternal value*, in that it shows it to be founded in the Eternal Self-consciousness, that is to say, in God. Not only is justice a law of man's being, but a law of the universe, of which man is a part. Not only, therefore, must the universe be considered as an ethical system, but also the observed process of the universe, the process of evolution. Now men of science are absolutely unanimous in inferring from the observed laws of nature that life must eventually become extinct upon the earth. If this involved the disappearance from the universe, that is to say, the extinction, of man, the highest product of evolution, there would appear to be no possibility of avoiding the conclusion that the process of evolution, as far as the earth is concerned, is without ethical purpose.

It would be like a railway with its terminus in the midst of a desert. That Charles Darwin was forcibly impressed by this consideration is shown by the following extract from his autobiography :—

" With respect to immortality, nothing shows me [so clearly] how strong and instinctive a belief it is as the consideration of the view now held by most physicists, namely, that the sun, with all the planets, will in time grow too cold for life, unless, indeed, some great body dashes into the sun, and thus gives it fresh life. Believing, as I do, that man in the distant future will be a far more perfect creature than he now is, it is an intolerable thought that he and all other sentient beings are doomed to complete annihilation after such long-continued slow progress. To those who fully admit the immortality of the human soul, the destruction of our world will not appear so dreadful."

This consideration, therefore, affords strong scientific support to that belief in immortality which has been held by the great philosophical thinkers and the great religious teachers of all ages. Moreover, the self-consciousness of man which, through the realisation of his freedom, rises into personality, involves, not

only specific determination, but self-determination. That such personality should become disintegrated through the disintegration of the material body through which it functions is unthinkable, and we see how completely justified was Professor Huxley's statement[1] that physical science "effectually closes the mouths of those who pretend to refute it [the continuance of the human spirit after death] by objections deduced from merely physical data." Science and superstition ever have been, and ever will be, deadly foes, for they are, to a very great extent, rivals seeking similar ends by very different methods, and it is by their methods, and by their methods only, that they are distinguishable. The method of science is the method of reason, and the method of superstition is the method of unreason. The end sought by both is the passage from the particular to the general, the comprehension of isolated facts within general statements. The first step made by each is the same, a more or less guided guess. Science calls this guess a hypothesis, while superstition calls it a fact.

Science tests its hypotheses by comparing their results with all possible available facts

[1] *Science and Morals*, p. 143.

that appear likely to be relevant, and it multiplies these facts to the utmost extent possible by suitably devised experiments. The hypotheses are only retained as long as their consequences prove to be in agreement with facts. When the consequences are in agreement with every relevant fact with which they can be compared they pass into established theories. But even then the proof that they are inconsistent with a single known fact will ensure their rejection, so that the path of scientific progress is bordered by the rubbish heaps of discarded theories.

Superstition does not seek to test the guesses which it calls facts, and when it is driven to make the comparison, and the guesses are disproved, superstition continues to call them facts, and denies or distorts the actual facts. If a scientific hypothesis or theory be retained after being shown to be inconsistent with ascertained facts, it thereby becomes a superstition. It is therefore clear that a statement clothed in scientific terms may quite possibly be, and not infrequently is, a pure superstition; thus, for example, a discarded scientific theory may be resuscitated as a superstition, and imposed upon the ignorant and uneducated as science.

The purposeless mechanical view of the world upon which Marx founded his mechanical theory of society is usually dressed up in this manner, in the discarded rags of science, for the purpose of imposing it upon the ignorant. The materialistic view of the world was still held by some thinkers of ability at the time that Marx was formulating his theories, although it has never been accepted by a first-class thinker of any period. It was handed down from the minor Greek philosopher Democritus and his teacher Leucippus, and may have originated with them. Democritus is said to have visited the East, and his ideas were just such as might have been derived from the theory of Vedic philosophy by the rough-and-ready method of interchanging the places of mind and matter, or in other words, by standing the Vedic theory upon its head, just as Marx derived his method from that of Hegel. Materialism as a theory of the world has now, for several decades, been discarded by all rational thinkers as a proved absurdity, and Socialism has fallen back upon a modification which attempts to avoid the fundamental fallacies of Materialism by the introduction of other absurdities less easily recognisable by the unscientific. This

modification has had the advantage, moreover, of being presented in vigorous and impressive language by a writer who had acquired a considerable reputation as a biologist by genuine scientific work accomplished long before he deserted the scientific method for the method of superstition. The biologist is Professor Ernst Haeckel of Jena. His definite declension from the scientific to the superstitious method was first clearly set forth in an address given at Altenburg in 1892, and published under the title of *Confession of Faith of a Man of Science.* The position there taken up was elaborated in a popular treatise, bearing the title *World Riddles*, which appeared in 1892, and was translated into English and published under the title of *The Riddle of the Universe*, a year later. The system propounded in this volume is based on physical hypotheses which are inconsistent with each other, and with the fundamental laws which form the observational foundation of dynamics and of the whole structure of physical science. Even if the mutually destructive elements could be eliminated, the assumptions essential to the scheme would involve the destruction of the very foundations of modern science, and its

replacement by the most primeval superstition. Sir Oliver Lodge, writing in the *Hibbert Journal*, and in his little volume on *Life and Matter*, expresses the opinion that it would be impossible for a physicist to discuss such theories in terms of courtesy. Although, however, it may be impossible for the physicist to extend courtesy to physical absurdities, it does not follow, nor would Sir Oliver's remark carry any such implication, that there is any necessity that the most unsparing criticism of the absurdities themselves should involve personal discourtesy to their author. No physicist would think for a moment of blaming a man of science for falling into error, even into absurd error, in spheres of knowledge beyond his range. He would at most suggest that it would have been wiser on his part to have consulted some competent authority before giving expression to them, more especially before placing them before readers incapable of scientific discrimination. He could not, however, without disloyalty to the very principles of scientific method, refrain from severe condemnation of an attitude which, in the face of competent criticism, seeks to maintain the errors by the denial or distortion of the facts. For this is

essentially the attitude of superstition, and the attitude of science to superstition must ever be one of irreconcilable hostility. That the method here adopted is one which can involve no personal discourtesy is vouched for by Professor Haeckel himself, for he has not hesitated to account for opposition to his views on the part of biologists like Du Bois Reymond, and his own teachers, Baer and Virchow, by a gradual psychological metamorphosis, translating them, in their mature years, from the standpoint of science to that of dogmatism and superstition. He has even applied the same argument in the case of such giants in the world of thought as Immanuel Kant and Sir Isaac Newton. There can, therefore, be no possible discourtesy involved in tracing the course of his own psychological metamorphosis on the very lines which he has attributed to thinkers with whose ability he would not even dream of placing his own in comparison. We can willingly concede the claim which he makes in the preface to *The Riddle of the Universe*, where he writes:—

"The one point that I can claim, and which, indeed, I must ask of my strongest opponents, is that my Monistic Philosophy is sincere from beginning to end—it is the complete expression

of the conviction that has come to me, after many years of ardent research into Nature, and increasing reflection on the true basis of its phenomena."

I do not think that any competent critic could question the absolute sincerity of Professor Haeckel's belief in the truth of his own opinions, although the critic may at the same time be entirely opposed to the unscientific, and in some cases, morally reprehensible, methods by which Professor Haeckel endeavours to impose his opinions upon those who are not able to test their value.

Professor Haeckel's work on the Radiolaria, Sponges, and Jelly Fishes received wide and well-deserved recognition from men of science, but his later and more ambitious work on General Morphology already showed traces of dogmatism, and the scant recognition which it received from his scientific colleagues, and the scientific world generally, induced him, as he tells us, to appeal to a popular audience, and his first popular work, the *History of Creation*, was published in 1868. It contains much of interest and value, but its usefulness to the readers for whom it was intended is much lessened by the fact that unconfirmed hypotheses are frequently stated as facts, a definite

declension from the scientific method to that of superstition. Moreover, as was pointed out by Professor Rütimeyer, Haeckel, in order to support his exaggerated estimate of the similarity in the embryos of man, the ape, and the dog, had simply reproduced the same diagram with three different titles. In the course of the discussion which naturally followed upon a charge of such gravity as the imputation of intellectual dishonesty, Haeckel admitted the fact, saying that he had been guilty of a piece of thoughtless folly. This exposure did not prevent his repetition of similar tactics, for in 1907 he published a pamphlet entitled *The Problem of Man*, in which diagrams of the embryos of man and of various apes were represented for comparison. In the following year a pamphlet entitled *The Ape Problem* was published by Dr. Brass, in which he maintained that some of these diagrams were inaccurate and others deliberately falsified. For example, one of Haeckel's plates purported to represent a human embryo and an embryo of the Gibbon-ape, side by side. The latter had been altered, by the omission of several vertebræ, from a drawing by Selenka of the embryo of a Macacus, another species of ape; while the former had been altered, by the addition of

eleven vertebræ, from a drawing by Wilhelm His. The charge was substantiated by reproductions of the faked diagrams side by side with the originals. Haeckel was unable to deny the damaging accusation, and admitted, in a reply which appeared in the *Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung* of January 9, 1909, that he had to confess that a few, six to eight per cent. of his embryo drawings, were "really forgeries in Dr. Brass's sense," these being diagrams for which the observed material was so incomplete or insufficient as to compel him "to fill in and reconstruct the missing links by hypothesis and comparative synthesis." He then attempted a more than lame justification by charging other workers with similar practices, writing as follows :—

"I should feel utterly condemned and annihilated by this admission, were it not that hundreds of the best observers and most reputable biologists lie under the same charge. The great majority of all morphological, anatomical, and embryological diagrams are not true to nature, but are more or less doctored, schematised, and reconstructed."

This wholesale accusation naturally raised a storm of indignation amongst German biologists, who hastened to point out that no serious

scientific worker ever published schematic or conjectural diagrams of forms not actually observed without expressly stating the fact.

Another striking example of Haeckel's unreliability, where he wants to make a point, is afforded by his treatment of the well-known story of Laplace and Napoleon.[1] In *The Riddle of the Universe* he repeats this story, with an added gloss representing Laplace's remark as a profession of atheism, although Laplace was certainly not an atheist. In a later work[2] Haeckel has falsified both the Emperor's question and Laplace's reply, turning the latter into an actual profession of atheism. He places both question and answer within quotation marks. In his *Confession of Faith of a Man of Science,* Haeckel calmly asserts that the opinions there expressed are shared by "all men of science who possess sufficient acquaintance with science; sufficient acuteness of judgment; sufficient moral courage; and sufficient strength of mind to free themselves from religious prejudices."

The amazing self-complacency of such a claim will be more fully appreciated by the reader after considering the character of

[1] See *The Problem of the Universe*, p. 448.
[2] *Last Words on Evolution*, p. 20.

Haeckel's scheme as set forth in *The Riddle of the Universe*. I very much doubt if Haeckel could have found a single man of any scientific standing at all who would not have repudiated it. Haeckel's initial assumption is that there is no purpose or conscious directivity in the universe, and was based on the presence, in various organisms, of apparently useless organs. This basis was completely demolished by Professor Huxley's criticism in *The Academy*, in 1869.[1] Haeckel then assumes the whole universe to have been filled with a substance —ether—which, impelled by the desires of its component particles, each of which is supposed to have sensation and will, tends to form material atoms by a process of condensation. This idea is taken from an unscientific German writer, and is simply a revival of the supposititious systems of complex ethers believed in before the days of Newton, and derived, through Greek thinkers, from a misconception of the Vedic philosophy of ancient India. In order to avoid the absurdity of attributing consciousness to every particle of ether and matter, Haeckel assumes that their sensation and will, though capable of influencing their

[1] See also Huxley's *Critiques and Addresses*, or *Darwinisms;* or *Problem of the Universe*, p. 494.

motions, are unconscious. This is more than an absurdity, for unconscious sensation and unconscious will are meaningless self-contradictions, just as square circles would be. I have shown elsewhere[1] that if this absurdity were cleared out of the system, in the only way possible, it would lead to the rational view of Chapter IX. As given by Haeckel, the system would conflict with observation in two ways :—

(1) The existence of particles possessing the inherent power of changing their own motions would be inconsistent with Newton's laws of motion, which form the basis of dynamics. If, for example, Newton's laws were not fulfilled, it would have been impossible to predict the return of Halley's comet. It would not have come to time. All the calculations of the planetary motions would fail to predict their places correctly, and all the calculations of dynamics, continually employed by engineers in designing constructive work, would lead to incorrect results.

(2) Haeckel's ether would not transmit light, or heat, or other forms of electric waves. In order to account for a thunderstorm we should have to abandon any theory of electricity, and fall back on the explanation that it was

[1] *Problem of the Universe*, p. 625.

due to the conflicts in the will and desire of the atoms. The atoms would be elevated into deities, a much more primitive conception than the comparatively intellectual one of the gods of Olympus, which would at least enable us to account for a thunderstorm by the thunderbolts of Jupiter. Haeckel's scheme would, in fact, replace modern physical science by a very crude form of polytheism. To take a simple example :—the few trillions of atoms contained in a penny are, according to the explanation given by modern physics,[1] held together by that same force of gravitation in obedience to which the moon moves in its orbit round the earth. According to Haeckel's scheme the atoms of the penny hold together because they want to, because they love one another too dearly to separate if they can help it. For the complete substantiation of this brief criticism by quotations from Haeckel's statements I must refer the reader to *The Problem of the Universe*, pp. 617–625, where he will find interesting examples of other absurdities, and of the kind of verbiage which Haeckel presents in the place of argument. He may be amused to learn, for example, that Haeckel regards logic as simply a branch of physiology.

[1] *Problem of the Universe*, p. 428.

As pure mathematics is simply a branch of logic, it would follow that the whole science of pure mathematics is a mere branch of physiology.

Haeckel calls this crude polytheism, with its countless atomic gods (not less than thirty trillions in a penny), by the name of Monism, which means Unity. The Rev. J. Gerard, in *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer*, suggests that Myriadism would be a better term. As Professor Haeckel is so in love with the term Monism, in spite of its being entirely inappropriate, I should feel inclined to suggest that the difficulty might be met by calling it *Myriadistic Monism*. This is a self-contradictory expression, and would therefore be peculiarly appropriate for the representation of a system founded upon the self-contradiction of unconscious will.

The Riddle of the Universe, in which this philosophy of Bedlam is elaborated, is largely occupied with rabid attacks on Christianity and every form of Theism. I do not think a serious attempt at argument is to be found in the book. There are, however, assertions in abundance, and these assertions are often stated to be arguments, and the author informs us that they either prove or disprove other

assertions. He tells us sometimes that some hypothesis, for which there is no shadow of proof, is of great value in determining a point of controversy. This, as we have seen, is essentially the standpoint of superstition as opposed to that of science.

Haeckel asserts again and again that his standpoint is that of Goethe and Spinoza, but various learned German critics have shown in detail that he has nothing whatever in common with either of these great thinkers. It will be sufficient to give one example here. Haeckel describes himself as a Pantheist, but explains that Pantheism is merely a polite name for Atheism. In Haeckel's case that is all it can mean, for on page 78 of his *Confession* he makes the absurd statement that "God is the infinite sum of all natural forces, the sum of all atomic forces, and all ether vibrations."

Spinoza writes: "I conceive that all things follow with inevitable necessity from the nature of God, in the same way as it is conceived that it follows from God's nature that God understands himself."

Goethe writes: "The time of doubt is past, one would now as soon think of doubting his own existence as that of God"; and again in a letter to Jacobi: "Spinoza does not prove

the existence of God—existence is God—and while others find fault with him as an Atheist, I should prefer to celebrate him as *theissimum et christianissimum.*" In his repeated rabid attacks upon Christianity and all forms of Theism, Professor Haeckel no more attempts anything in the shape of argument than he does elsewhere. He prefers gross and offensive misrepresentations. His authority for some of the most scurrilous of these is a purveyor of scurrility of the lowest type, who prefers to veil his own name of Stewart Ross under the pseudonym of Saladin. Haeckel refers to him as a theologian of repute, but in the latest English edition of *The Riddle of the Universe,* since Haeckel's well-deserved castigation, for his "disgraceful ignorance," at the hands of Professor Loofs, some of the misstatements made on this estimable person's authority have been withdrawn.

It is an utterly distasteful task to have to denounce such anti-scientific vagaries on the part of a once genuine scientific worker, and if they had been addressed to scientific readers capable of estimating their value, I should have passed them by in silence. When, however, the reputation which Professor Haeckel acquired in his early years, by his patient observation of

the lower forms of life, is being made use of to give an aspect of scientific authority to an attempt, by the wide circulation of these vagaries in cheap editions, to impose the most crass primeval superstitions upon the ignorant and uneducated, it becomes necessary to speak in plain language.

Even as a biologist Professor Haeckel is not regarded seriously by scientific workers, simply because of his deserting the scientific method for that of superstition, and attempting to support his own views by entirely illegitimate methods. In the *History of Creation* Haeckel drew out with heraldic minuteness an imaginary genealogy of man. As scientific observation only made it possible to sketch its probable nature in the merest outline, the details were entirely imaginary, and were simply Haeckel's guesses. Yet they were presented to popular readers as facts. The great physiologist, Professor du Bois Reymond, pointed out that a genealogy drawn up in this manner had about the same value that the genealogies of Homer's heroes would have to a scientific historian. Even in biology, therefore, except in the special sphere in which he is an expert, Professor Haeckel's opinions carry little or no weight in the scientific world.

His opinions on general questions of physics and philosophy are simply put aside with a simile as obviously farcical.

These opinions, regarded as purely farcical by every man of science to whose notice they have been brought, have been adopted as a "scientific" basis by the little group which calls itself "Rationalist." The term was originally applied in a disparaging sense to nearly all thinkers by those foolish, but often well meaning, religious people, who thought that religion and reason were incompatible, and preferred to retain their religious beliefs at the expense of their reason. The following of reason to its legitimate conclusion is the essential foundation of all philosophical and scientific thought, and therefore no philosophic or scientific man ever dreamed of calling himself a Rationalist. But just as the terms Quaker and Methodist, originally employed in a disparaging sense, have been adapted by religious bodies, so a little group of followers of a school of thinkers of the last century adopted for themselves the name of "Rationalists." The thinkers passed away in due course, and the stream of scientific and philosophic thought flowed on. But, as so often happens, the group which had formed itself about these thinkers had crystallised their

views into a creed, and the creed remained when the thinkers had passed away. The Rationalist creed is therefore one of the many examples of the scientific thought of the past forming a foundation for the superstition of a later period. The "Rationalist" creed has become a "Little Bethel" of the usual type, and its advocates are quite happy upon their own little mudbank, and are not even aware that their ship has been stuck fast in the mud for years, and that the stream of progress has left them stranded. They still think that their obsolete superstition represents the latest advances of science, and their attitude is exactly described in the well-known lines from De Morgan's "Budget of Paradoxes":—

"Who chirp, chirp, chirp, with a grasshopper glee—
We're the lamps of the Universe, We! We! We!
But Time, whose speech is never long—
He hasn't time for it—stops the song
And says—Lilliput Lamps—leave the twopenny boxes,
And shine in the 'Budget of Paradoxes!'"

Mr. Robert Blatchford tells us, in *God and my Neighbour*, that he is a "Rationalist," and on p. 150 he makes the complaint:—

"The odds against the Rationalists are tremendous. To challenge the claims of Christianity is easy; to get the challenge accepted

is very hard. Rationalists' books and papers are boycotted. The Christians will not listen, will not reason, will not, if they can prevent it, allow a hostile voice to be heard."

One would suppose from this that Mr. Blatchford was burning with anxiety to reason. One would not imagine that he would run away and hide himself when he was invited to reason. We have seen in Chapter V. how he responds to such invitations.

"Rationalists" are very ready to issue challenges in a general form, but they are equally ready to run away when the challenges are accepted. In the spring of 1910 I was passing with a friend, one Sunday afternoon, through a street of one of our most important provincial towns. Our attention was attracted by a notice outside a public hall announcing a lecture by a "Rationalist," whose name I refrain from mentioning. The notice was as follows :—

TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD.
A CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY.
Discussion Invited.

I suggested that we might possibly have a little diversion, disclaiming at the same time any intention of discussing points of

theology, which is not my sphere of action. The lecturer read a discourse mainly concerned with the criticism of some Little Bethel system from the point of view of his own Little Bethel. But in his opening the lecturer made three distinct statements dealing with fundamental scientific and philosophical propositions. They were not required for his subject, and were indeed irrelevant, but they seemed to impress the audience. But not for long. I asked permission to traverse all three statements, and I traversed them. I was followed by a well-meaning, but futile and apologetic, speaker from the purely religious point of view. The lecturer replied to the second speaker, and then, after a little hesitation, practically told his audience that he was only expecting to have to reply to pop-guns, and that he could not be expected to stand up and face the artillery of science. So he sat down amidst chilling silence.

It would scarcely be fair play to give these illustrations, which I might easily multiply, of the intense desire usually exhibited by the present-day "Rationalist" to run to cover when confronted with reason in the shape of science, without mentioning the one exception whom the author has had the pleasure of meeting

The report previously referred to, of the debate between Mr. Joseph McCabe and himself, on *Theism and the Problem of the Universe*, shows that this gentleman made a most valiant fight for an untenable position. And he had no better weapons than those ancient superstitions: the pre-Newtonian ether, evolved, in all probability, from misconceptions of the introspective philosophy of the Vedas; and the loves and hates of the elements, an hypothesis due to Empedocles, whom Aristotle calls the "Father of Rhetoric." It is true that both these ancient weapons had been refurbished and painted over, by Haeckel, with coats of modern paint which might lead the uneducated to look upon them as fearsome engines from the factories of modern science. But the paint was transparent in the light of science, which rendered only too evident the utter inadequacy of these antiquated toys. Mr. McCabe did not, however, lose heart. He first brought up a well-horsed dummy gun, which was drawn up and down in front of his position. But it was soon seen to be only a dummy — the contention that the author had not presented the full demonstration of a fundamentally important proposition for the

judgment of the audience. The dummy had to be ignominiously withdrawn when it was made clear that the complete proof had been laid before Mr. McCabe six weeks earlier, because of its involving mathematical considerations of a high order of difficulty, utterly unsuitable for presentation to a popular audience, and that the suggestion had accompanied it that Mr. McCabe should seek competent mathematical aid for its criticism. Even when brought to this desperate pass, the brave defender of the purposeless universe of the "Rationalist" creed would not confess to defeat, as long as he remained upon the platform, and he proudly claimed that "Professor" Marmol, a member of the audience, had "riddled the whole argument." The production, at so late a stage, when the present writer no longer had the opportunity of challenging it, should have been enough to warn the least intelligent that this was but another dummy. It appears to have been enough, however, to encourage the organ of the "Rationalist Press Association," in its next issue, to execute a war-dance in the shape of an editorial article. The author reprinted this in the preface to the report, not for its literary or intellectual merit, for he has never

been able to ascertain whether it was written by the editor or the office-boy, and has sometimes been tempted to imagine that the office-boy might even be the editor. It was reprinted because it so obviously invited, not denunciation, it did not call for that, but the gentle, kindly ridicule appropriate to the antics of the humble frog which hopes to swell itself to the size of the bull. A copy was sent to the Association, and its more sober members evidently considered the ridicule to be well-earned, as no reply has been attempted. The author also took the opportunity of suggesting to "Professor" Marmol, in a footnote, that he would doubtless seize the opportunity, by publishing his criticism, of obtaining a wider recognition of his mathematical abilities than the admiration of the restricted circle in which he appears to be regarded as an authority. This suggestion has also remained unanswered, and it is for this reason that the title "Professor," prefixed by Mr. McCabe to Mr. Marmol's name, has here been printed within inverted commas, as it is evident that he is not a Professor of Mathematics, or of any other branch of science. Perhaps he is "Professor" of calisthenics, or dancing, or legerdemain, but,

whatever may be his calling, Mr. McCabe's assertion that he had "riddled the argument" was obviously nothing more than the exhibition, as a last resource, of the only object within reach which could be employed, for the moment, as a final dummy gun.

CHAPTER XII

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN GROWTH AND DECAY

We found in Chapter VI. that the comparison between the development of a community organised as a State and the growth observed in the world of living matter provided some very serviceable analogies. We saw, however, in Chapter X., that these analogies must not be pressed too far, since the unqualified conception of the State as an organism, as commonly postulated by the Socialist, would logically involve the conclusion, in complete contradiction to experience, that the course of human evolution is not an upward progress, but a regress towards the state of the beast. We are now in a position to solve the problem presented by the existence of such analogies, and thereby to determine the nature and extent of their limitations.

Some organisms are unconscious and others conscious, but all exhibit purposiveness, the existence of purposiveness being the criterion

of life, which was formulated by Herbert Spencer as a capacity for "the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations."[1] According to the rational view of the world, set forth in Chapter IX., unconscious purposiveness arises entirely from the action of the Universal Mind. In conscious organisms some portion of this action is accompanied by consciousness on the part of the creature, while in the case of man, whose personality involves self-consciousness, he himself shares in that directivity. There are, therefore, three kinds of organisms to be considered, unconscious, conscious, and self-conscious. It is obviously quite conceivable that a collection of unconscious, or merely conscious, organisms might form a community, all acting in perfect harmony in such manner as best to promote the interests of the community without reference to the interests of the individual units. Such a community might be regarded, without any qualification, as an organism, and a very perfect example, consisting of conscious units, is afforded by a hive of honey bees. In a community of honey bees there is no regard for the interest of the

[1] *Principles of Biology*, vol. vii. p. 74. See also *Problem of the Universe*, p. 467.

individual, only for that of the community, the great mass of which consists of workers. These work unceasingly, except when sleeping, or when hibernating during the cold weather, and they are differentiated both from the males and females, so as to be adapted for the work of the hive and nothing else. During the hours of daylight, in the warm season, their only relaxation consists in the regular interchange, amongst the individual workers, of the various kinds of work required. Only one female, or queen bee, is retained for each hive, but, to provide against accidents, more young queens are raised than are actually required for the outgoing swarms, the surplus being remorselessly destroyed. A surplus supply of males, or drones, is also raised, only the strongest of which mate with the young queens, and die immediately afterwards. The remainder are destroyed as remorselessly as the surplus queens.[1]

A hive of bees affords, therefore, a perfect illustration of the ideal Socialist State, an ideal which could be attained only, as we saw in Chapter X., by the complete extinction of the self-consciousness inherent in human personality. In the bee-hive there is something very

[1] See Maeterlinck, *The Life of the Bee.*

closely akin to, if not absolutely identical with, the collective consciousness which is the dream of the Socialist. When the queen grubs are ready to emerge from their cells as young queens, they endeavour to eat their way out, but the workers on guard continually add wax to the outer wall until the old queen has departed with the first swarm. Then one only is allowed to emerge, and she immediately begins to tear open the other queen grub cells in order to destroy their contents. If there be sufficient surplus of these she is allowed to destroy a certain number, and is then stopped by the guard of workers, and many observers have noted how they act all together, as though animated by one will, although under no visible direction.

In the case of self-conscious units, as in a human community, such results would be attainable only by a complete conscious merging of the will of every individual in the general will. It would be necessary for every individual man or woman to be conscious of no individual will, no individual desires, distinct from the will and desire of his or her fellows. The personality would have to be completely merged in a collective personality. The full attainment of such a unification of will by a human

community under any conditions practically realisable in this world is obviously impossible. The nearest approximation that could well be imagined would be that of a community in which personal initiative had been reduced to so low a level that it would contentedly submit to the despotic rule of a dictator or a ruling caste. This is the only form of Socialism which has ever been contemplated by any consistent and consecutive thinker, and which has ever been carried out in practice on any extensive scale.

A complete State Socialism of this type existed for many centuries in ancient Peru. The king and the nobles formed the ruling caste. Outside this caste, every Peruvian was compelled to marry at a fixed age. He received a house and, for maintenance, a land allotment, increasing with his family. His taxes were paid in labour. The country was self-sustaining and self-contained, so that no complication arose through foreign trade. Each family received sufficient wool to be made into garments by the women, under inspectors entitled to enter every house at all times. The apportionment of labour was effected with kindly consideration, the population being treated like children. The enfeebling

effects were shown by the facility with which the people were reduced to slavery by their Spanish conquerors. Such a benevolent kindly retention in absolute subjection of the masses, and their reduction to the condition of a big family of happy children, appears to be the highest summit of State Socialist aspiration. It is, as we saw in Chapter V., exactly the condition which Mr. H. G. Wells hopes might be realisable under modern conditions, though the candour and honesty of his thought compel him to contemplate the possibility, or rather the probability, of its leading to something very greatly inferior.

The facility with which the ancient Peruvians were reduced to the harshest slavery finds a parallel in the ease with which a community of bees may be made to work, not for their own benefit, but for that of the bee-master. Any completely organised collectivist human community would be similarly at the mercy, not only of its existing rulers, but of any power strong enough to displace these rulers and control the machine for its own benefit. Even the partial communism which is known to have existed amongst many primitive tribes so weakened them, that they have long since been overrun, and either absorbed or destroyed

by their more individualistic, and therefore more virile, neighbours.

The only smaller communities which have achieved any permanent success on a socialistic basis have been those founded and carried on by religious enthusiasts, generally fully communistic, who have, of their own free will, subjected themselves to a rigid rule under the control of a superior with dictatorial powers. The most noteworthy examples are the religious orders of the Christian and other great religions. The Socialist may quite justifiably claim their continuing vitality as a living proof of his contention that there must be a profound verity underlying the ideal of Socialism, even in its extreme form of Communism. He may take as a concrete instance the well-known and widely-diffused Jesuit fraternity. He may point out how its members, many of them men of great mental power, have, ever since the foundation of the order, been content, at the bidding of their ruler, to devote their mental powers to the training of the child mind in the humble obscurity of a children's school, and yet ready, at the same bidding, to go forth at a moment's notice, to the very ends of the earth, into its most savage and repellent wilds —sometimes in small bands, but often alone—

to uplift the standard of their faith, often with a heroism and self-abnegation before which that of the volunteer leader of the forlorn hope in battle may almost pale into insignificance. All this we must admit. The Socialist may then, with triumph in his heart, ask us if we can maintain that the communism of these men has in any degree led to a suppression of their personality, to a weakening of their character, to anything indicative of regression towards the state of the beast, and we must answer No.

Is it then the case that, after having dislodged the Socialist from one after another of what he regarded as impregnable strongholds, the anti-Socialist at last finds looming before him a last and final stronghold which is truly impregnable, and from which he must retire discomfited? For this he must do if it be in the occupation of the Socialist forces, and if he cannot dislodge them from it. We shall find, however, that the stronghold itself is at an elevation so great as to be attainable only by the few great thinkers and great seers of humanity, and that for the greater part even of these, if not for all of them, the atmosphere is too rarefied to permit of more than brief and transitory occupation in the present stage of

human existence; and that, while a few of the more disinterested leaders of Socialist and Anarchist thought have drawn their inspiration indirectly from it, not one of them has ever obtained a direct glimpse of it. The State Socialist has seen it faintly represented as a mirage as he gazes upon the arid desert on one side of the plain from which rises the mountain up which humanity has been climbing so painfully throughout the ages, and mistakes the mirage on the face of the desert for a land of restful meadows and running streams. The Communal Anarchist is quite aware that it is but a mirage, and he turns his gaze to the other side, the bottomless morass, and in its muddy waters he sees a pale reflection of the glories above him, and takes it for reality. Each sees and ridicules the folly of the other, but both are agreed in turning their gaze downward instead of upward, so they join forces in preaching, as a new gospel, the return to the level of the beast. This they call Socialist unity—they are united in the aim of descending to the lowest levels. It will be time enough, when they have reached them, to begin the conflict which is to decide whether the band shall follow the mirage into the desert, or the reflection on the waters into

the bottomless morass. It occurs to none of them that they are turning their backs upon the goal, which is still, as ever, far above them, and that their hopes are as baseless as those of the dog which dropped the bone in its mouth in order to seize upon its reflection in the water beneath him. To demonstrate the validity of this statement of the case we must inquire into the nature of the religious impulse, and account for the tendency, which it so frequently exhibits, to realise itself in communistic societies.

The study of comparative religion shows that the religious consciousness in its lower, and presumably earlier, stages manifests itself as a realisation of a relation between the self and a higher self or selves underlying the observed phenomena of the external world. The development of the religious consciousness in its many diverse forms consists essentially, as that great psychologist, Professor William James, has so completely demonstrated,[1] in a gradual simplification of self-consciousness, most fully exemplified in the life experiences of the saints and mystics of the ancient religion of the Vedas, of Buddhism, of Christianity, and of Mohammedanism. In its highest

[1] *Varieties of Religious Experience.*

exemplifications in some of the Vedic and Christian saints, this simplification extends, not only to a complete unification of the self-consciousness, but to its complete identification with, and merging into, the all-embracing and self-existing unity, the Eternal Self-consciousness itself.[1] When this ultimate unification is attained solely by the intuitive development of the religious consciousness, the finally unified conception of the Eternal Self-consciousness, that is to say, of the Deity, is arrived at through mental presentations which differ widely in the votaries of different religions, being coloured by the pre-existing religious belief of the individual. Where, however, the ultimate conception of complete unification is attained, the final result is the same in all cases, and is identical with the results obtained by purely philosophical thought. Moreover, modern science, philosophically completed by the removal of the limitations inherent in the unification attainable by purely scientific thought, leads to the same goal. Entrance into the stronghold which we have been contemplating is therefore nothing less than the complete conscious identification of the individual human self with the

[1] The author has dealt with this in detail in *Modern Physics and Rational Ethics*, Lecture IV.

Eternal Self, and through it with all other human selves.

It was this inexpressibly lofty ideal which inspired the sole so-called Socialism of Maurice and Kingsley, which I have called Sociality. It is the glamour of its faint reflection which has inspired the best of the Socialist leaders, and which has induced many well-meaning Christians, in whom the sentiment of benevolence is not controlled by reason, to forsake the path towards ideal perfection for the pursuit of the mirage beneath them.

It follows, therefore, that the unqualified conception of an organism could only become applicable to a human society, consisting as it does of self-conscious units, if every member of that society had consciously attained to that exalted ideal of humanity which has been completely and continuously represented on earth only in the life of Christ. If a human society, as now constituted, is to be regarded as an organism, it can therefore be as a strictly limited analogy only, and the nature of the limitation is now easily seen. Apart from the complete conscious unification of all separate selves in the Eternal, all-embracing Self, there can be no true collective consciousness.

We now see why it is that the nearest

approximation to such conditions is exhibited in the religious orders. The immediate object of the members of such orders, expressed in the language of science, is to order their lives in such manner as may best advance them on the path of the gradual simplification of the self-consciousness, that is to say, the upward path leading towards complete unification. One of the methods consciously adopted is to cultivate submission to the superior, who is accepted as representing the authority of the Deity, that is to say, as the guide by which each may best seek and follow the law of his being. All material considerations are regarded as hindrances to be eliminated, not as good things of which each is desirous of obtaining the largest possible share consistent with justice to his fellows. Will and character are therefore strengthened by the discipline, for it is self-discipline, not external constraint.

A human society can therefore be regarded as an organism only in that state of ideal perfection, unattainable in this life, which represents the ultimate aim of the highest religious aspiration. This is, however, quite sufficient to account for the usefulness of the analogy as it was employed in Chapter VI. It justifies us, therefore, in drawing a general

comparison between the elements of growth and decay in an organism, and the constructive and destructive elements in a human community.

I have now fully demonstrated the constructive nature of religion, which is usually assumed as a fact that needs no demonstration. The other general constructive forces are: (1) Prescientific, or unco-ordinated, knowledge; (2) Science, or co-ordinated, reasoned knowledge; (3) Philosophy. Religion may be considered as making a fourth. As opposed to the first of these, we have the destructive force of Ignorance, and opposed to Science we have Superstition. Philosophy is concerned with investigating the possibility, conditions, limitations, origin, and unification of knowledge, and is therefore, when founded upon sound scientific knowledge, a higher stage than the latter. The complete unification which forms the final goal of Philosophy is also the final goal of Religion, as we have already seen. There is no advance beyond Superstition, which is a development of ignorance, and therefore Superstition may be regarded as the antithesis of Philosophy and Religion as well as that of Science.

The forces of growth and decay, of construction and destruction, are arrayed against

each other in every community and in every individual, so that it is only in a general sense that we can classify existing groups of human beings as being on the constructive or destructive side. Knowledge and Ignorance are at war in every human being. Probably every man of science, every philosopher, and every religious man, is to some extent tinged either by the methods or the results of superstition; and, on the other hand, many who are obviously fighting in the ranks of superstition are to some extent scientific, to some extent philosophic, to some extent religious, in a perfectly true and valid sense. This does not, however, make such a classification practically useless, or even difficult. The facts that the most learned are ignorant of some things, and that the most ignorant have some knowledge, do not in any way prevent us from practically distinguishing between learned men and ignorant men, although they make it impossible to divide all men into two mutually exclusive classes according to their learning or their ignorance.

This simple example will serve to illustrate a difficulty which is encountered in all attempts to classify natural phenomena. There may be no possibility of questioning the validity of the general principles upon which the classification

is founded. The correctness of the general outlines of the scheme may be indisputable, while the position of a given object may give rise to much controversy. Some reasons may be urged in favour of placing it on one side of a certain dividing line, and reasons which may appear stronger to some and weaker to others for placing it on the other side. This difficulty increases with the complexity of the system which is dealt with. It is least in the physics of inorganic matter; in the domain of biology it is much greater; in politics, which deal with the most complex aspects of human communities, it is greatest of all. It is therefore in the domain of politics that the element of personal judgment must necessarily become most prominent. In the attempt, therefore, which I am now about to make, to apply the general principles arrived at to the existing political crisis in this country, I shall have to ask my readers for even more patient, calm, and candid consideration and weighing of the arguments presented to them as they accompany me, from the sphere in which the reasonable and candid mind can hardly stray very far from the well-marked course, into the complex and debatable sphere of present politics, where, even amongst the most reasonable

and the most candid, that which appears to one mind as an incontrovertibly reasonable judgment may be regarded by another as a mere prejudice. It appears to me that at no previous period of our national history has there been so definite a marshalling of the forces of destruction against the forces of construction, of the elements of decay against the elements of growth, as is to be discerned in the existing political crisis. If this indeed be the case, then it is surely the bounden duty of every man who attaches any value at all to his birthright as a son of the British Empire, to concentrate all the powers of his intelligence upon the problem of determining the sphere of his own right action, and to devote all his energies to translating his reasoned conclusions into immediate and vigorous action. The present is a critical moment at which we may well apply Nelson's noble words, paraphrased to suit the extension of our Empire, and say, *The British Empire expects every man to do his duty.*

The present position has been compared with that existing in France at the outbreak of the French Revolution, in a remarkably able and brilliant article by the well-known author of "Musings Without Method," in *Blackwood's Magazine* for February 1911, from which, by

the kind permission of Messrs. Blackwood, I am enabled to quote at considerable length. Before doing so, however, I must point out that, close as the parallel is in many respects, there was no such definite leaguing of the elements of growth on the one side and the elements of decay on the other, as is now to be seen in our own political crisis. The upheaval of the French Revolution consisted in the attempt to overcome disintegrating forces of a very pronounced character, which honeycombed the Government and governing classes of France at that period, by launching against them the even more disintegrating forces of Anarchy. According to de Tocqueville, the French Revolution was very largely due to the arbitrary nature of the Government, under which, as he points out, "there were no provincial checks of any avail to save the farmer from any excessive imposts, or the labourer from grievous oppression." In our political crisis, on the other hand, the forces of disintegration and decay are united in the attempt to impose upon us an arbitrary Government, an absolute despotism of the Ministerial Cabinet, in order to pave the way for the disintegration of the Empire. I will continue in the words of the writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* :—

"The politicians who, to win the favour of the people, remove the checks which tradition has placed upon hasty legislation, are foredoomed to failure. If only they would read or think, the experience of revolutionary France should be sufficient for them. Let Lord Acton, himself a Whig, speak the just word of warning. 'The errors that ruined their enterprise,' said he of the States-General, 'may be reduced to one. Having put the nation in the place of the Crown, they invested it with the same unlicensed power, raising no security and no remedy against oppression from below, assuming or believing that a Government truly representing the people could do no wrong. They acted as though authority, duly instituted, requires no check, and as if no barriers are needed against the nation.' With a few verbal changes, this passage accurately describes the dangers that lie ahead of our present Government. The licence of the French people was cured only by twenty years of warfare and a military dictatorship. The licence, which is the aim of Mr. Asquith and his colleagues, were it achieved for a moment, could be arrested only by a counter-revolution. If democracy be unchecked by a Second Chamber there can be no resort save to arms, and we believe

that when the time comes, if ever it come, a patriot will be found to save the country from an infamous oppression.

"The history of the French Revolution, indeed, contains many apt lessons for the present day. Like all revolutions, it began in pedantry, and passed through seas of wantonly shed blood to an iron-handed tyranny. Even in the recently published Lectures[1] of Lord Acton, an inveterate Whig, the main lines of its movement may be clearly observed. At the outset the reformers filled their mouths with specious phrases. . . . The Parisians chattered lightly of that absurd chimera called the Rights of Man. They professed a passion for freedom, and yet were incapable, like all the champions of freedom from the beginning of time, to define it. They were sure that Nature was a better guide than civilisation. Rousseau had declared that the people was infallible, and Rousseau found fervent followers throughout the length and breadth of France. It was accepted as an axiom of life that 'the people, necessarily sincere and true and incorrupt, cannot go wrong.' Polite maxims were babbled on every side. Copybook headings appeared to contain the last words of

[1] *Lectures on the French Revolution*, by Lord Acton.

prescience and philosophy. Tom Paine was elevated to the throne of wisdom, and his clumsy insults to all that was comely and of good report filled the empty heads of the infallible people. Even when bloodshed began to stain the pedants red, the sanctity of the assassins still gained credit. Lavoisier wrote to Priestley 'that if there had been some excesses, they were committed for the love of liberty, philosophy, and toleration, and that there was no danger of such things being done in France for an inferior motive.' That, no doubt, is precisely the argument that would be urged by the heroes of Sidney Street in their own behalf if they still lived. The Mauser pistol is but its logical conclusion.

"The next stage in revolution is easily reached. When the infallible people has been sufficiently flattered and endowed with all the virtues, it is fit to govern. And constitutions are put before it by the dozen. Like undergraduates sitting for an examination, all the false prophets of France sat them down to answer questions about government. . . . France was given more constitutions in a few years than could be applied in as many centuries, and it is a proper tribute to their folly that not a vestige of any one of them is left

to-day. They are enshrined, all of them, in the history books, and they are as much like living things as is a dried leaf in a botanist's collection."

"It is a strange and incontestable truth, that moral maxims influence the foolish mind more ardently than a direct appeal to rapine and assassination. France, glutted with proverbs and freed from the common checks of human life, settled down comfortably to the guillotine. As Lord Acton says in a passage which our Radicals would do well to ponder, 'the parting of the ways in the Revolution was on the day when, rejecting the example of England and America, the French resolved to institute a single, undivided legislature.' After that rejection, there was no chance of moderate counsels or revised judgments. The reins of power fell into the hands of those who knew no argument for their opponents in opinion save murder, and who proved eloquently the tragic conclusion of Taine: 'Man is a wild beast, carnivorous by nature, and delighting in blood.' But the wild beasts of the Revolution, the man-eating tigers, escaped suddenly from the jungle, went beyond the usual ferocity of such beasts, because they acted in concert and by design. They were not satisfying their individual appetites. They

were obeying a law of lust, imposed upon them all. It has been pretended by the apologists of the Revolution that the September massacres were the irrational and spontaneous act of some hundreds of jail-birds. This, Lord Acton proves to be wholly untrue. 'In reality,' he writes, 'the massacres were organised by the Commune, paid for by the Commune, and directed by its emissaries. We know how much the various agents received, and what was the cost of the whole, from the 2nd of September to the 5th.' The hireling murderers, who actually shed the blood, were the most humane of them all. If they could spare a victim, they rejoiced. The pitiless monsters were those who armed and directed them, who saw no punishment but death for men of other breeding and opinions than their own, and who were themselves the victims of inverted erotomania.

"These were a pleasant company, these preachers of the doctrine of equality, which meant, as it means to many politicians of to-day, 'government by the poor and payment by the rich.' Each will doubtless have his own favourite among them. . . . Robespierre in some respects outstrips all rivals."

"Even Robespierre himself pales to amiability beside the arch-criminal Marat. . . .

This gentleman based his cruelty upon an opinion which of late years has been expressed by responsible Ministers. He considered 'that the rich have no right to enjoyments of which the masses are deprived.' He carried his theory one step farther, holding that what he called 'the guilt of selfishness and oppression could only be expiated by death.' Death, in fact, was the only punishment he knew save torture. He actually proposed from his place in the Assembly that 'obnoxious deputies should be killed by torture, and their quarters nailed to the walls as a hint to their successors.' That would have given to politics a poignancy of interest which, for the rest, in his time they did not lack. And though this amiable suggestion was strangely rejected, when he died in his bath there perished the most hideous monster of a monstrous age.

"Such was the new era which Lord Acton says 'dawned upon the world.' After the death of Robespierre there came a sudden lull. It was as if the lust of blood had worn itself out, and war followed fortunately with its cleansing influence. The work of the Revolution was already done and extinguished. Nothing had been put in place of the monarchy which the Revolutionaries had

abolished, and the way was made plain for the genius of the autocrat. Napoleon brought back all that the apostles of bloodshed had destroyed—a strong Government, a haughty nobility, the stern pride of power and place. Nothing save aggression could have purified the conscience and purged the wickedness of France, and she went to war with a light heart."

"Lord Acton declares that we shall never rightly understand the French Revolution if we regard it as exceptional. We should think very ill of the human race if we did not regard it as an exceptional episode of folly and madness. It is true that few great or honest men came out of it until it was purified by war. It created pedants and criminals by the dozen. It brings us into the society of men 'fit for Tyburn,' to use Lord Acton's own expression. But these men were exceptional, every one of them. Maniacs, with the lust of blood and torture, rarely come into the world. More rarely still do they come in battalions. And if the French Revolution be not exceptional, then must we tremble for our own future. For the most desperate champions of blood started from the same point at which our own politicians stand to-day.

They began, as the Radicals of England have begun, by hating the nobles and the Church, by reciting like drones the commonplaces of revolution, by prostrating themselves before the infallible people. They ended in the September Massacres and the Terror. If their progress were normal, how will it be possible for England to escape from its present crisis save by the way of Tyburn or Tower Hill?"

"*Hating the nobles and the Church:*" "*reciting like drones the commonplaces of revolution:*" "*prostrating themselves before the infallible people.*" How many would remain of the coalition arrayed against the British Constitution in the existing House of Commons, if all were excluded to whom one or other of these phrases apply? Mr. Asquith hates neither the nobles nor the Church. He has already created peers at a greater rate than any of his predecessors. But he cannot venture to maintain that he has not obtained much of his support by playing upon, and accentuating these hatreds. And what is the policy of the coalition of which he is the nominal head, if not a log-rolling policy essentially founded upon, and deriving its very life from, class hatreds and their skilful manipulation? It is a policy, moreover, of verbal

prostration before the will of a people which is not fit to be entrusted with the referendum, the people's ballot. The Ministry *stoops to conquer*, prostrates itself before the people with mock humility, in order to obtain their acquiescence in the erection of an irresponsible oligarchy exercising an absolutely unlimited despotism. For, as that able constitutional lawyer, J. A. R. Marriott points out,[1] "If the 'veto' of the Lords is destined to follow the veto of the Crown, the British House of Commons will find itself in possession of a power without parallel among the institutions of the civilised world." Since the present majority of the House of Commons simply registers the decrees of the wire-pullers of the coalition, the British Empire would fall under the despotic sway of an oligarchy consisting of Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Winston Churchill, and Mr. Dillon (himself largely under the sway of Mr. Patrick Ford), with perhaps Mr. Ramsay MacDonald playing a subordinate part.

In venturing to suggest the names of the quartette who at the moment appear to have their grip upon the principal strings which

[1] *The Machinery of Constitutional Amendment.* "The Nineteenth Century and After," February 1911.

more or less determine the successive scenes in the coalition puppet-show, I must entirely disclaim the intention of any such foolishness as attempting anything in the nature of a prediction. The objects of the warring sections are so diverse, and the number of sections is so numerous, that even during the short session of the last Parliament the show has borne a greater resemblance to a series of kaleidoscopic patterns than to a drama representing the development of a definite idea. And recent happenings suggest an increase rather than a decrease in the intrusion of the unforeseen into the immediate future. Mr. Churchill's first trial as his nominal leader's understudy was not a conspicuous success; and many of Mr. Lloyd George's friends and opponents alike are asking themselves just now whether his somewhat meteoric political career is about to terminate in a sensational display of fireworks, or whether he is to remain a leading light on the Radical-Socialist stage.

That this is no exaggeration of the result which would necessarily follow if the Government were successful in its attempt to emasculate the House of Lords, is clearly shown by the following classical passage from the authoritative manual of British Law, Blackstone's

Commentaries, which is quoted by Mr. Marriott in the article referred to above :—

"The power and jurisdiction of Parliament," says Sir Edward Coke, "is so transcendent and absolute, that it cannot be confined, either for causes or persons, within any bounds. And of this high court," he adds, "it may be fairly said, *Si antiquitatem spectes, est vetustissima; si dignitatem, est honoratissima; si jurisdictionem, est capacissima.* It hath sovereign and uncontrollable authority in the making, confirming, enlarging, restraining, abrogating, repeating, reviving, and expounding of laws, concerning matters of all possible denominations, ecclesiastical or temporal, civil, military, maritime, or criminal; this being the place where that *absolute despotic power* [the italics are mine], which must in all governments reside somewhere, is entrusted by the constitution of these kingdoms."

This is the power which the present Government is endeavouring to concentrate, nominally in the hands of the Cabinet, actually in the hands of the irresponsible little group of wire-pullers who call the tune to which the "grave and reverend seigneurs" of the Cabinet are compelled to dance, however galling it may be to their sense of dignity. Is the story of *Magna*

Charta forgotten? Is the name of Hampden to be honoured no longer? Have British and Irish men and women forgotten the names and the deeds of all the heroes who, in our past history, have poured out their life's blood as well as their treasure in the long conflict through which our liberty has been attained? If they have forgotten, then surely the knell has already sounded which marks the entry of the British Empire upon the path of downfall. If they have not, then the knell that has sounded must be that of the Government which has dared to demand a surrender to a tyranny so utterly ignoble. It is the High Court of Parliament, consisting of the three estates of the realm, the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal, and the Commons, which constitutes the British State, of which the King is the head. It is this High Court which, by its acts, has built up that British Constitution which has for ages been regarded as a very synonym for liberty.

The written constitutions of the revolutionary period embraced by the Commonwealth and the Protectorate did not endure, and, with these temporary exceptions, the British Constitution has been developed step by step. As Mr. Marriott tells us in the article

previously referred to, "A specific grievance has manifested itself, and a specific remedy has been applied;" and later on he points out that the principal reason that this method of development has proved so successful is that hitherto, amidst all our political differences, there has been, except at the time of the Commonwealth, a general agreement upon fundamentals. The Constitution has, therefore, grown freely like a tree which the gardener has made no attempt to trim into rigid and ungainly forms, contenting himself with thinning out a few superfluous branches which were impeding the growth of the more important limbs. It has now become a great and noble object, such as only the natural growth of ages can produce. Yet the astounding demand is now made that it should be hewn down—and for the most inadequate of reasons. Mr. Dillon and Mr. Redmond desire it in order that its fall may divert the attention of Great Britain while they accomplish their project of sowing Ireland with nettles—in other words, placing it under the domination of the most blood-stained and criminal of Irish secret societies, the *Molly Maguires*. The State Socialist leaders desire it in the hope that they may be allowed to erect a convict prison for

the people on the vacant space, and that the keys will be handed to them. The Anarchists desire it in the hope that they may be allowed to sow the vacant space with noisome weeds, which is the Anarchist method of making a garden. The Radicals desire its downfall because its ancient grandeur overshadows them.

It is for such sorry reasons that the discordant factions which compose the coalition are prepared to replace the ancient bulwark of British liberty, the British Constitution, by the chiefs of the Molly Maguires, the first gentleman in Billingsgate, and the Opportunist whose claim to glory lies in having "banged, barred, and bolted" the door through which Britain's Colonies are endeavouring to pass to a closer union with the Mother Country. The prospect is not alluring, in spite of the fact that the gentlemen possessing these qualifications are to have the benefit of the assistance of an under gardener who has exhibited a real capacity of emancipating himself from some of the superstitions of the chiefs under whom he has served.[1]

The constructive, scientific method is to strengthen the great tree of the Constitution by fertilising the soil in which its roots are

[1] See *ante*, p. 83.

embedded, and by letting in additional light and air by the skilful removal of decayed and superfluous branches; to maintain and improve the conditions of growth, not to cut it down in the vague hope that something better will somehow emerge from the internecine strife of its would-be destroyers.

The maintenance of internal order and resistance to external aggression are the essential conditions of growth in the body politic. In early feudal times these functions were fulfilled by the King and his barons, together with the then powerful and united Christian Church, which consistently played the part of peacemaker between warring factions, championed the weakness of the people against the King and against the barons, and greatly assisted the progress of the people by enabling them to utilise for their own advance the opportunities continually presented to them by the conflict between the power of the King and that of the barons. It was Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, who led the barons in their great contest against King John, which terminated in the granting of *Magna Charta*, the foundation-stone of the English Constitution and of English Freedom. Before this, Commoners had been added to the King and

barons as a portion of the State, and so initiated the English High Court of Parliament, now the High Court of Parliament of the United Kingdom, and which Constructive Unionism aims at developing into the High Court of Parliament of the British Empire.

One most disastrous result of the weakening of the power of the Church at the Reformation, by making it little more than an appanage of the State, was to upset the balance of the Constitution. Prior to this the Lords Spiritual had, in virtue of the constitution of a Church independent of nationality, occupied a position of great power as well as dignity, and this power was almost invariably exercised on behalf of all such claims of the poor and oppressed as it recognised to be just claims. Moreover, the Church, by its spiritual efforts, not only acted as an almoner on a large scale, but maintained the grandest principle of feudalism, the essential inseparability of privilege and responsibility. Feudal proprietorship invariably involved the continued rendering of services both to the King, as head of the State, and to the dependents of the individual proprietor. The landlord was entitled to use, but not to abuse, his possessions. The idea of absolute ownership, of the

right to the abuse as well as to the use of property, developed only as a consequence of the decay of the old sense of duty. Duties, not rights, formed the main theme of the Church's teaching, and in the days of its proud independence it was as able as it was willing to enforce obedience to its precepts upon the highest as well as upon the lowest.

When the Church was reduced to a condition of subservience to the State, one of the most disastrous results of the change was that for several centuries it preached mainly the duties of the poor and weak, and the rights of the rich and powerful. This it was, and not simply differences of religious belief, which led to Dissent, and gave rise to the Free Churches. These, originating, as they did, in the neglect of its duty by the State Church, infused new life into the latter by their remorseless exposure of its shortcomings.

The sudden disturbance in the equilibrium of the constitution, by the radical change in the status of the Church at the Reformation, led, as such sudden changes always do, to further conflicts centring mainly about the personal power of the King. It was the unregulated and violent exercise of this personal power which originally disturbed the equilibrium, and the

secondary disturbances arising from it culminated in the revolution which dethroned King Charles I., and took his life, and substituted the despotism of the House of Commons for the Constitution. This despotism became so unendurable that it made it possible for Oliver Cromwell to assume a personal dictatorship, which was so little to the taste of the country that on his death the Stuart dynasty was restored. The personal power of the King was, however, not restored to anything approaching its previous extent, the tyranny of the Commons being held in check mainly by the increased strength of the House of Lords. From that time the power of the monarch, as such, steadily decreased until, as at the present time, the King reigns but does not rule, his acts being entirely those of his responsible ministers, the ministers themselves being responsible to the High Court of Parliament.

Concurrently with the gradual elimination of the personal rule of the monarch, and as its natural consequence, there arose the Party System, the division of the two Houses of Parliament into Tories and Whigs. The Tory party was mainly represented by the landed aristocracy who, for the most part, still retained, to a very considerable extent, the

inherited aristocratic tradition of feudalism, the inseparability of property and responsibility. The fundamental principle of this party, however much it may have been obscured at times by unworthy self-interest, has always been *government for the benefit of the whole people, and not for the benefit of a class only.* The main strength of the Whigs, on the other hand, lay in the new plutocracy which had arisen from the great modern development of manufacturing industry and trade. The main object of the party, at the time of its initiation, was the by no means unjustifiable one of obtaining for themselves a share in the privileges hitherto pertaining only to the aristocracy. The Whig party therefore originated essentially as a class movement, seeking class privileges, and if I am right in my reading of our recent history, this is a characteristic of which neither the original Whig party, nor its successor, the Liberal party, a Liberal being only a new name for a Whig, has ever succeeded in divesting itself. It has not always stood for the privileges of the same class, but it has always stood for the privilege of a class or classes against the Tory ideal of government for the benefit of the whole people. About fifteen years ago Mr. Gladstone broke

up the old Liberal or Whig party by his capitulation to disruptive Home Rule for Ireland. It was then that the Unionist, or English, party was formed out of the old Tory party, which had then come to be known as the Conservative party, together with some of the best and most stable elements of the Liberal, or Whig, party. The two names, Unionist party and English party, were both suggested as alternatives by Lord Randolph Churchill, and the Unionist party, in standing, as at present, for the freedom and progress of the nation against the tyranny of a log-rolling coalition of the House of Commons, is only carrying out the grand old Tory principle of *government for the benefit of the whole people, and not for the benefit of a class only*. I must be content with illustrating this by a very brief consideration of the most important recent labour legislation. Before doing so I must, however, give one striking example of the danger of the most well-meant legislation defeating its own object unless carried out in the light of reason and experience.

I referred, on p. 227, to the considerable, and totally unjustifiable, encroachments on common land which were effected during the course of the nineteenth century. Mr. George

Howell, who has been such an indefatigable worker in the promotion of legislation beneficial to labour, tells us[1] that between the years 1800 and 1845 "no fewer than 1060 new Enclosure Acts were passed, enclosing 2,801,612 acres." Moreover, this was not effected by landowners from motives of greed. The common land was "handed over to landowners and lords of manors at a minimum cost" with the object of increasing and cheapening the food supplies by bringing more land into efficient cultivation. It was a radically bad policy, in spite of the good intentions which inspired it. As Mr. Howell observes: "This was the wiseacre policy of the State, at the instance of the landowning interests, to stave off famine or food scarcity." The great majority of the legislative projects of the doctrinaire Socialists, though very possibly quite as well intended, would prove even more harmful to those whom they propose to benefit.

The Factory Acts, the beneficial effects of which to the workers can scarcely be exaggerated, originated in the necessity of providing a remedy for the terrible and revolting treatment of the unfortunate workhouse

[1] *Labour Legislation, Labour Movements, and Labour Leaders*, p. 7.

children who were *provided for* by the Parish Authorities by indenturing them as apprentices. As long ago as 1784 the Magistrates of the Manchester Quarter Sessions resolved unanimously that it was "highly expedient for the Magistrates of the County to refuse their allowance to indentures of Parish Apprentices whereby they should be bound to owners of cotton mills and other works, in which children are obliged to work in the night or more than ten hours a day." [1]

The first Ten Hours' Bill, which limited the hours of children in the cotton factories to ten hours during the day, was brought forward, in 1815, by the Tory Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel. In September 1830, Richard Oastler, "a Churchman, a Tory, and an advocate of the abolition of slavery in the West Indies," [2] reopened the matter by a series of letters on "Yorkshire Slavery" in the *Leeds Mercury*, and at the end of 1831 Michael Sadler, M.P., "Tory philanthropist and writer on political economy," introduced a further Ten Hours' Bill, which was strongly opposed by the manufacturing interest, and referred to a

[1] Reports, 1814–15, vol. v. Quoted in *A History of Factory Legislation*, by B. L. Hutchins and A. Harrison, with a preface by Mr. Sydney Webb.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Select Committee. At the dissolution of Parliament in 1832, Sadler lost his seat, and his place was taken by Lord Ashley, afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury, who, with the support of the House of Lords and of the Tory party in the House of Commons, although at the beginning this was of a half-hearted character, and in the teeth of strenuous opposition from the Whig representatives of the manufacturing interests, succeeded in passing the First Factory Act in 1833. Lord Ashley continued for many years after this a strenuous campaign in which factory legislation was extended and improved, and he was supported by Lord John Russell, a Whig, who thereby incurred much odium from his own party. John Bright was one of the most unrelenting opponents.[1]

It was the Tory Minister, Benjamin Disraeli, who introduced the Reform Act of 1867, the effect of which is described by Mr. George Howell in the following terms: "The enfranchisement of large numbers of the working class, by the provisions of that Act, increased the influence of labour leaders in the constituencies, and the power of the working classes at the polling booths."[2]

[1] *Factory Legislation*, Hutchins & Harrison, p. 90.
[2] *Labour Legislation*, p. 167.

Mr. Plimsoll was strongly supported by Lord Shaftesbury, formerly Lord Ashley, in his valiant endeavours on behalf of our sailors. The Merchant Shipping Bill was talked out in the House of Commons under the Gladstone Government in 1873, and, when reintroduced in 1874, was defeated by a majority of three. The Government had, however, in the meantime, in deference to the agitation on the subject, introduced a temporary Bill. In 1876, when a Tory Ministry had come into power, it was introduced by the Government and rapidly passed through the House of Lords.[1] Mr. Asquith's Government, on the initiation of Mr. Lloyd George, has largely reduced its effectiveness.

The House of Lords is invariably represented on Radical platforms as preventing or impeding legislation for the benefit of the working classes. The following list of Bills initiated in that House, and it is by no means an exhaustive one, shows how little truth there is in such a contention.

The Truck Acts. The first of these was introduced in the House of Lords by the Duke of Wellington's Government in 1830, was persistently objected to in the House of Commons, reintroduced in the House of Lords by Lord

[1] *Labour Legislation*, pp. 277–280.

Wharncliffe in 1831, and became law in the same year, after bitter opposition from the Whig or Liberal party in the House of Commons. Further measures with the same beneficent object were passed by Conservative Governments in 1874, 1887, and 1896.

Then we have the Settled Land Act of 1882, and the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1884. The latter arose through the adoption by Lord Salisbury of a Standing Order of the House of Lords, that in the case of every railway passing through the Metropolis, compensation should be given to disturbed workmen, and sufficient housing accommodation provided for those displaced.

The legislation for the better housing of the working classes originated in a resolution moved by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords in February 1885. A Royal Commission, of which King Edward VII., then Prince of Wales, was an active member, was appointed to report on the subject, and the resulting Bill was passed by the House of Lords in July 1885, and by the House of Commons in November of the same year.

The Criminal Law Amendment Act, for the protection of women and children, was passed by the House of Lords in 1884, dropped by the

House of Commons, reintroduced and again passed by the House of Lords, and became law in 1885.

In 1887 the House of Lords initiated the Allotment for Cottagers Act, and the Irish Land Act, which enabled 150,000 tenants to have fair rents fixed by the Law Courts, and gave freedom of sale of tenants' interest. In the same year the House of Lords introduced the Law of Evidence Bill, of which the main purpose was to allow persons charged with criminal offences, and their husbands and wives, to give evidence on oath. It was rejected by the House of Commons, owing mainly to Irish obstruction.

An Electric Lighting Bill, designed to remedy the enforced stagnation in the electric lighting industry, and which would have provided employment for many workmen, was ignored by the House of Commons. A second, and then a third Bill (Lord Thurlow's) were passed by the House of Lords, and the last was passed by the House of Commons in 1888, to the immense and immediate benefit of the industry.

The Railway and Canal Traffic Bill, to provide a Court of Appeal to prevent traders and workmen being injured by undue preference and unfair railway rates, was introduced

in, and passed by the House of Lords in 1887, dropped in the House of Commons, reintroduced and passed by the House of Lords, and after much opposition in the House of Commons, became law in 1888.

The Lunacy Amendment Act of 1889 was introduced and passed by the House of Lords for the first time in 1886, and again in 1887, 1888, and 1889, and the fourth time the House of Commons passed it. Its object was to provide increased safeguards for persons of unsound mind.

The Education of Blind and Deaf Children Act was introduced and passed by the House of Lords in February 1891, but was not accepted by the House of Commons until September 1893.

Two Bills for the Inspection of Workshops were introduced by Lords Thring and Dunraven in 1891, and passed by the House of Lords, but the House of Commons did not proceed with either of them.

The Church Patronage Bill, designed to give parishioners the opportunity of raising an objection when an unsuitable clergyman was presented to a living, was first introduced in the House of Lords in 1886, and passed in 1893. It was rejected in the House of Commons.

A Land Transfer Bill and a Bill for the Employment of Discharged Soldiers in Government Offices were introduced and passed by the House of Lords, but neither of them was accepted by the House of Commons. The Hours of Railway Servants Bill, which was introduced and passed by the House of Lords in the same year, was subsequently passed by the House of Commons, and became law.

As a final example we may take the Alien Pauper Act, which was the outcome of Lord Salisbury's Committee on "Sweating." It was passed by the House of Lords in 1894, but Sir William Vernon Harcourt, who was then the Leader of the House of Commons under a Liberal Government, refused to allow its discussion. It was reintroduced, in an altered condition, in 1905, under a Unionist Government, as the Immigrant Aliens Act, and became law.

This volume appeals to the rational thinking man or woman, and is not addressed to the emotionally unstable individuals who are swayed from side to side by mere rhetoric. These latter are incapable of the mental effort requisite to the intelligent understanding of the logic of hard facts, and of reasoned arguments founded upon them. It is in order to influence

them that Mr. Lloyd George dons the motley, becomes "the first gentleman in Billingsgate," and arouses them to stormy enthusiasm with baseless fictions and floods of unreasoning invective. Is it for their sake again, or is it merely the revelation of his true inner self, when he casts off the last trammels of convention which have hitherto shielded the dignity of the British Minister of State, even more punctiliously in a foreign land than in his own, and daubing himself with the reddest of red paint, like a redskin upon the warpath, dances a wild carmagnole in the company of the irresponsible and mentally undisciplined scribblers who gain their daily bread by the inditing of rabid incitements to *sabotage* and disorder of every kind?

The author must candidly admit the defect, if defect it be, of his mental constitution and training, which makes it impossible for him to free himself from the supreme tyranny of reason, and to transform himself into a howling or a dancing dervish for the benefit of the emotionally unstable persons to whom Mr. Lloyd George and his like make so irresistible an appeal. The reader whose emotional nature is guided by reason will find ample proof in the preceding pages that the Tory Party

and the House of Lords have fulfilled the conditions which entitle them to be regarded as constructive, and not destructive, forces. Their legislative action has been, not legislation for a class or for classes, but for the whole people.

I expressed the personal opinion, earlier in this chapter, that the Tory Party had in its past history fulfilled these conditions more completely than the Whigs. It may be that this is a prejudice on my part, and that a Whig writer might make out as strong, or nearly as strong, a case for the constructive character of his party in the State. The question is, however, one of little consequence from our present point of view, for the Unionist Party is not the successor of the old Conservative or Tory Party alone, but absorbed at its formation some of the best and strongest elements of the Liberals or Whigs. This process of transfer to the Unionist Party of the best elements of wisdom and experience of all shades of thought has continued ever since, and has been greatly accelerated by the open and undisguised alliance of the present Government with the Socialist forces of disruption, and its utter abandonment of every fundamental principle of the old Liberals

and Whigs in order to enter upon the rapid descent into the abyss of national destruction. This Government has turned its back upon the principles of individual liberty and economical administration. It is creating a bureaucracy of portentous and ever expanding dimensions, a steadily increasing burden upon the taxpayers, and is attempting to erect itself into an irresponsible despotism, the temper of which is illustrated in the Bill recently introduced by the Home Secretary, by the clause which is to compel every collier to take a bath as he leaves his work. Perhaps, if the Government were successful in establishing the despotism contemplated in their Parliament Bill, the next step would be the appointment of an army of officials for the forcible bathing of recalcitrant miners. The Radical Party, which forms the main support of the Government, is therefore shown, by its actions and its professed aims, to be essentially a destructive and not a constructive force. This conclusion is confirmed by analysing out its principal constituents.

First of all we have those who cling to the empty name of Free Traders, and still believe in moulding the fiscal policy of the United Kingdom upon the worn-out shibboleths of John Bright and the old Manchester School of

Economists in the face of the complete falsification of all their forecasts. Their view was that if Great Britain initiated the abolition of international customs and barriers, the whole world would very shortly be induced to follow its example, as they believed that it would become evident to all that the raising of revenue by import and export duties was an unsatisfactory and expensive method. Other countries, however, did not follow suit, but each preferred to aim at the adjustment of its tariff to the advantage of its own people. Experience confirmed their initial belief in the possibility of this, with the result that nearly the whole civilised world, including all our own colonies, arrange their tariffs with this aim. The present Radical-Socialist Government holds on to the Free Trade label, which it interprets as the application of the general principle that import duties should be imposed only on goods which cannot be produced in our own country, so as to prevent our own industries receiving any protective assistance. This does not, however, prevent their imposing additional protective duties on such *manufactured* articles as cocoa and tobacco. Is it a mere coincidence that the leading cocoa manufacturers support the Radical Party by their newspapers, and that they and the chief

tobacco manufacturers are mostly financial pillars of the party? The claim of the tariff reformer is that the tariff, instead of being regulated by worn-out and now meaningless shibboleths and theories, tempered by considerations of party interest, should be adjusted with a view, in the first place, to benefiting the people of the United Kingdom by affording protection to home products, in the same way that the trade unions afford protection to home labour; and, in the second place, to building up and strengthening our world-empire by mutual preference between ourselves and our colonies, so making our whole empire more self-sustaining and independent than it could otherwise be, and, at the same time, obtaining for the whole empire the maximum advantage attainable by its united strength and the judgment of its rulers. These are the essential principles of the Tariff Reform movement. They are opposed by two groups of so-called Free Traders on perfectly distinct grounds. One group maintains that no adjustment could be devised which would benefit the people as a whole. The other group, the Little Englanders, object to the consolidation of the Empire which they see would be the result of carrying out the Tariff Reform policy skilfully

and effectively. In my opinion, and it is that of practically the whole civilised world, with the exception of the first group of our own so-called Free Traders, there can be no question that the ever advancing Tariff Reform party is the party of construction and growth, and that the moribund party which labels itself Free Trade is the party of disruption and decay.

The third Radical group consists of those Nonconformists whose hatred and jealousy of the Established Church of the country is so much greater than their zeal for the Christianity which they nominally profess, that they are willing to become active allies of the anti-religious forces of disruption in order to achieve the object of their desire.

The fourth group consists of those rabid so-called temperance advocates and abolitionists, whose one end and aim is to penalise and ultimately destroy the liquor traffic in every practicable shape, and who oppose every attempt to improve the public-houses of this country, and transform them into healthful places of recreation and refreshment for the poor.

The remainder of the Radical Party consists mainly of faddists of various descriptions, each class of which sees a better prospect of obtaining attention to its projects from a disunited

conglomerate of discordant groups than from a party united in seeking, to the best of its ability, the general advantage of the whole people.

Outside the Radical Party itself, which is, at present, exactly equal in numbers to the Unionist Party, the coalition supporting the Government contains three groups: — The Redmondite Irish Nationalists, the O'Brienite Irish Nationalists, and the Socialists. The second of these groups is, in my opinion, entirely out of place in the heterogeneous coalition supporting the Asquith Government, for while the Redmondite Nationalists and the Socialists essentially belong to the destructive forces of decay, the policy of Mr. O'Brien and his followers is just as essentially a policy of conciliation and constructive growth. Since temporary lines of political cleavage only are determined by merely superficial differences, the permanent lines of cleavage resulting invariably from fundamental distinctions, I trust that no long period will elapse before Mr. O'Brien's forces, in all probability greatly increased in numbers at the expense of the Redmondites, will find themselves in their proper place, fighting side by side with, and forming an integral and honoured portion of the Unionist Party, standing shoulder to

shoulder for the healthy growth and consolidation of the British Empire against the tattered remnants of the forces of disruption.

The policy of Mr. Dillon, whose master is the Irish-American Patrick Ford, and who rules the Parliamentary group officially commanded by Mr. Redmond, is the establishment of an independent Ireland, subsidised by, and nevertheless hostile to Great Britain and the British Empire. The chief sources of the strength of this anti-British group lie in the ignorance of its Irish supporters and in the system of intimidation maintained by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, commonly known as the Molly Maguires, who have spread a network of terrorism over the South and West of Ireland. This Society, which I described earlier in this chapter as the most criminal and bloodstained of Irish Secret Societies, was an offshoot of the Ribbonmen. It extended its operations to the United States, where its criminal activities became so insupportable, that the famous American detective, Allan Pinkerton, was engaged to investigate its ramifications and bring the principal criminals to justice.[1] After two years incessant and dangerous work, the investigations set on foot by Pinkerton led, in

[1] *The Molly Maguires and Detectives*, by A. Pinkerton.

1876, to the conviction of twelve members of the Society for murder in the first degree, four for murder in the second degree, four as accessories to murder, and sixteen for conspiracy. These are the people against whom Mr. O'Brien, and Lord Dunraven, and the All-for-Ireland League are making so valiant a fight. Their methods were exposed to some small extent in the hearing of the petition which recently resulted in the unseating of a Redmondite Nationalist. The manner in which the Asquith Government neglects the primary duty of a Government, that of maintaining order, when the process is distasteful to Mr. Redmond, was shown by the issue of a fresh writ for the constituency by the Government, without the adoption of any precautions for holding an election uninfluenced by terrorism, and the consequent withdrawal of the O'Brienite candidate because of Mr. O'Brien's unwillingness to expose his supporters to outrage from which the Government would take no efficient measures to protect them.

Mr. George Wyndham's Land Purchase Act, passed by a Unionist Government in 1903, was hailed with approval by almost every corporation and individual in Ireland, with the exception of the gombeen men, or moneylenders. It was a

fair compact between the State, the landowners, and the tenants. It worked well—too well—for difficulty was found in financing it, and, in 1909, the Radical-Socialist Government replaced it, *mirabile dictu*, with the consent of the majority of the Irish Nationalist members, by Mr. Birrell's Act, which created a chasm between the landowner and the tenant, and arrested the progress of land purchase, and the peace and contentment which accompanied it. The passage of Mr. Birrell's Act was vehemently opposed by some few patriotic Irishmen, led by Lord Dunraven in the House of Lords, and by Mr. William O'Brien in the House of Commons. But peace and contentment were not to the taste of the Irish Nationalists who now follow Mr. Redmond. The greater number of them are not men for whom there would be any use if Ireland were peaceful and contented. They would therefore be compelled to return to their previous humble avocations. These are the Irish representatives which accepted the burdens imposed upon their country by Mr. Lloyd George's "great fraud budget," with its enormous increase in stamp duties, placing impediments in the way of the purchase or sale of land, and its promise of killing the distilling industry, the one flourishing

industry in Ireland. Land purchase was to be arrested in favour of the Radical-Socialist alternative of making the State the landlord, and so replacing the old dual ownership, which had worked so ill in Ireland, by dual ownership in its very worst form.

The attempt to introduce Home Rule for Ireland under Ford-Dillon-Redmondite auspices would be the signal for civil war. Mr. O'Brien and the All-for-Ireland League are carrying the banner of peace and conciliation, seeking to attain, by mutual agreement, the management by the whole of a United Ireland of its own internal affairs in such a manner as would facilitate instead of hindering the great scheme of Empire consolidation and federation, at which our most far-sighted statesmen are aiming, and which would also facilitate the closer union, for the maintenance of the peace of the world, of the British Empire and the United States, the recent suggestion of which by Sir Edward Grey has been hailed with acclamation on both sides of the Atlantic.

There remains to be considered only the Socialistic group, and that every such group is essentially disruptive, essentially a portion of the forces of disintegration and decay, has been conclusively demonstrated in the earlier

chapters of this volume. Moreover, just as these last pages are going to press, the account comes to hand of the results of a year's government of the American city of Milwaukee, by a Socialist Mayor and Council elected in April 1910. The report of the Federated Trades Council shows that 20,000 out of the city's population of 375,000 are now tramping the streets in search of work, and numbers are leaving the city in disgust. Yet, outside Milwaukee, there is practically no permanent unemployment among the two million inhabitants of Wisconsin. It is the latest of the long list of Socialist experiments, every one of which, excluding the religious communities, has been a dismal and disastrous failure.

INDEX

ADDERLEY, Rev. J., his challenge accepted, 145
—— Is Socialism Atheism, 143
—— *The Parson in Socialism*, 289
Agriculture, improvement of, in the seventeenth century, 226
Aliens' Immigration Act, 373
Altruistic principle, the, 287
Anarchism, 101
Anarchist Congress, International, 102
—— precepts, 102
Anarchists, Communal, 90, 103
Aristotle on Communism, 167
Ashley, Lord, and the Factory Acts, 368
Atheism, J. R. MacDonald on, 81, 261

BAKUNIN, Anarchist motto of, 102
Balfour, A. J., on Materialism, 275
Barbon on values, 2
Bax, Belfort, on patriotism, 165
—— on Socialists' readiness to trample on the people, 93
Bee-hive, Socialist State compared with a, 330
Birrell, A., Irish Land Act, 383
Blatchford, R., Atheism and the Labour Party, 155
—— character and mentality of, 117
—— fundamental fallacy of his indeterminate determinism, 123
—— *God and my Neighbour*, 118
—— nature of his authorities, 133
—— *Not Guilty*, 118
—— profession of Communal Anarchy, 108
—— self-laudation of, 135
—— the retort courteous, 125
—— *The Sorcery Shop*, 109
—— tyranny of State Socialism, 98
Bois Reymond's, Prof. du, criticism of E. Haeckel's biological hypotheses, 319
Bourgeois, Socialist definition of, 70
Bright, John, and the Factory Acts, 368
—— and Free Trade, 376
Brotherhood of man, basis for, 171
Butler, President, on incompatibility of equality and liberty, 94
Butler, Sir William, on eternal justice, 178

Index

CAPITAL, constant, 42
—— definition of, 22
—— Marx's theory of, 21
—— minimum interest on, 59
—— variable, 42
Capitalists, classification of, 48
Christianity and the poor, H. M. Hyndman on, 223
Christianity, attitude of Socialist organisations towards, 146
—— E. Haeckel's rabid attacks on, 318
—— E. Renan on, 175
—— J. S. Mill on, 175
—— Lecky on, 180
—— W. E. Gladstone on, 181
Clarion, The, a Communal Anarchist journal, 104
—— Anarchist propaganda of, 105
—— as Mr. Facing-both-ways, 157
—— staff, intelligence of, 130
Class war, E. Ferri, on, 73
—— H. M. Hyndman on, 75
—— J. R. MacDonald on, 74
—— Marx's doctrine of, 69
Coke, Sir Edward, on the power of Parliament, 356
Commodities, 1, 17
—— fetishism of, 17
—— ghosts of, 23
—— Marxian circulation of, 25
Commons, encroachments on, 227, 365
Communal Anarchist leaders, 117
Communism, Aristotle on, 167
—— religious, 334
Communist Manifesto, 70
Communities, origin of, 288
Community rules and laws, 292
Consciousness, Materialist conception of, 270
Conservative Party, the, 375
Constitution, the British, 358
Constructive and destructive forces, 341
Croiset on principle of Anarchism, 102

DECAY and growth, the conflict between, 328
Depressions, industrial, Hobson's theory of, 233
Destructive and constructive forces, 341
Determinism, impossibility of materialistic, 259
—— materialistic, hypotheses of, 259
—— R. Blatchford's indeterminate, 123
Deville, G., on Christianity, 150
—— on the family, 88
Directivity, simple and general, 13
—— why Marx ignored, 255
Disraeli, B. (Lord Beaconsfield), and the Reform Act of 1867, 368
Distribution and production process, 50
Dunraven, Lord, and the All-for-Ireland League, 382
—— and Workshops Inspection Bill, 372

ELIZABETH, oppression of the working classes, 225
Energy, definition of, 277
—— the basis of matter, 278
Engels, F., Communist Manifesto, 70
—— identification of his work with that of Marx, 253
Englanders, Little, 378

Index

Equality destructive of liberty, 94
Evil, origin of, 283
Exchange-value, 1

FABIAN Society, 92
Factory Acts, 366
Family, G. Deville on the, 88
—— J. Guesde on the, 87
Ferrer and his Anarchist work, 106
Ferri, E., meaning of Socialism, 290
—— on class war, 74
—— on Marxism, xxv
—— summary of Marx's philosophy, 249
Flint, R., on Revolutionary Communism, 104
Feuerbach, influence of, on Marx, 253
Free Trade, cocoa and tobacco, 377
Free Traders, 376

GEORGE, Lloyd, and the Merchant Shipping Bill, 369
—— errors of his land taxation, 234
—— the "great fraud budget," 161, 383
—— vagaries of, 374
Gladstone, W. E., on Christianity, 181
Godwin, *Political Justice*, 256
Goethe, W., on the existence of God, 317
Goldman on Anarchist principles, 102
Grayson, V., of *The Clarion*, 138
Grey, Sir E., closer union with the United States, 384
Growth and decay, the conflict between, 328
Guesde, J., on the family, 87
Guilds, Artificers', Pope Leo XIII. on, 215

HAECKEL, E., descent from science to superstition, 306
Haeckel's physics, Sir Oliver Lodge on, 307
—— rabid attacks on Christianity, 318
—— scheme of the world, absurdities of, 313
Hammacher, E., on Marxism, 252
Hardie, Keir, in India and Egypt, 165
Hegel, attempt to unify mind and matter, 246
Henry VIII., robbery of the poor, 221
Hobson, J. A., analysis of production and distribution process, 50
—— on subsistence wages, 30
—— on the single taxer, 235
—— on the true basis of taxation, 237
—— on trade unions, 231
—— theory of industrial depressions, 233
Houndsditch assassins as Communal Anarchists, 104
Housing of the working classes, 370
Howell, G., encroachments on commons, 366
Huxley, T. H., criticism of E. Haeckel's biological hypotheses, 313
—— on immortality, 303
—— on Materialism, 260, 273
Hyndman, H. M., on Christianity and the poor, 213
—— on class war, 75
—— on the tyranny of State Socialism, 95

Index

IMMORTALITY, scientific arguments for, 302
—— T. H. Huxley on, 303
Independent Labour Party, 92
Interest, nature of, 53
Ireland, All-for-, League, 382
Ireson, F., on steady increase of wages, 32
Irish Land Act, 1887, 371
—— Mr. Birrell's, 383
Irish Land Purchase Act, 382
Irish Nationalists, 380

JACKSON, Cyril, on trade unions and unemployment, 228
Jaurès on Marxism, xxv
Jesus and Indian Yogis, 177
—— and Mohammedans, 177
Justice as harmony, 294
—— eternal, Sir William Butler on, 178
—— negative and positive, 293

KANT, I., existence has no meaning apart from consciousness, 246
Kingsley, Charles, and the Manchester School, 251
—— so-called Socialism of, 78, 130, 289, 339
Kropotkin, Prince, Anarchist teaching of, 107

LABOUR, constituents of human, 14
—— legislation, recent, 365
—— movement, true basis for the, 231
—— Party, *The Clarion* on the, 162
—— Party, *Justice* on the, 159
—— *The Socialist Standard* on the, 162
Labour process, Marx on the, 33
—— representation, proper nature of, 229
Land legislation, Irish, 199
—— taxation, errors of Lloyd George's, 234
Landowners, origin of, 63
Laurie, S. S., on justice in a Marxian society, 294
—— on Mind Universal, 285
—— on State collectivism, 297
—— on the function of the State, 295
Lassalle's *Iron Law of Wages*, 29
—— *Iron Law of Wages*, R. Flint on, 32
Laws, origin and purpose of, 292
Lecky on Christianity, 180
Legislation, true ideal of, 293
Leo XIII., Pope, and the conditions of the working classes, 201
—— on trade unions, 215
Liberal party, the, 375
Liberty incompatible with equality, 94
Life, Herbert Spencer's criterion of, 278
—— origin of, 263
Loafers, Lord Selborne on, 183
Lodge, Sir Oliver, on Haeckel's physics, 307
Lords, legislation initiated by the House of, 369
Lowerison, T., of *The Clarion*, 141

M'CABE, J., as a rationalist champion, 324
MacDonald, J. R., as an intelligent under-gardener, 83

Index

MacDonald, J. R., confuses Sociality with Socialism, 78
—— on Atheism, 81, 261
—— on class war, 74
—— on Marxism, xxv
—— on Marx's inversion of Hegel's dialectic, 247
—— *Socialism and Society*, 290
—— on the Socialist position, 79
Malatesta, Anarchist teaching of, 107
—— and the I.L.P., 105
—— *The Times* on, 105
Manchester School, Marx's exposure of the, 252
Marriott, J. A. R., on the British Constitution, 358
—— on the Parliament Bill, 354
Marx, Karl, and the Manchester School, 251
—— cause of influence of, 256
—— circulation of commodities, 25
—— Communist Manifesto, 70
—— doctrine of class war, 69
—— emotional condition of, when writing *Capital*, 252
—— on fetishism of commodities, 17
—— general features of his theory of Socialism, 245
—— his inversion of Hegel's dialectic, 247, 254
—— honesty of purpose of, 255
—— on the labour process, 33
—— profession of Atheism, 250
—— theory of Capital, 21
—— theory of Exchange-value, 1
Marxism and Socialism, xxv
Masters' Federation and Socialism in the trade unions, 229
Materialism, A. J. Balfour on, 275
—— H. Maudsley on, 299
—— hypothesis of, 259
—— limitation of outlook resulting from, 174
—— Sir Leslie Stephen on, 260
—— T. H. Huxley on, 260, 273
Materialist conception of consciousness, 270
—— hypothesis of origin of mind, 268
Materialists, early Greek, 305
Matter, energy the basis of, 278
—— H. Maudsley on the Moral Sense and Will in Criminals, 152
—— on the paradise of Materialism 299
Maurice, F. D., so-called Socialism of, 78, 130, 289, 339
Merchant Shipping Bill, 369
Mill, J. S., on Christianity, 175
—— on the contented pig, 131
Milwaukee, a Socialist experiment, 385
Mind, Materialist hypothesis of origin of, 268
—— the human, a finitisation of the Universal Mind, 281
—— the Universal, 279
Molly Maguires, the, 358, 381
Moneron, the, 267, 280
Monism, Haeckel's Myriadistic, 316
Morris, William, *News from Nowhere*, 109
—— on State Socialism, 116

Index

Müller, F. Max., *Gifford Lectures*, 141
Municipal and State trading, 239

NACHT on Anarchist principles, 102

OASTLER, R., and the Ten Hours' Bill, 367
O'Brien, W., and the All-for-Ireland League, 382
Organisation, T. Rogers on early English, 216
—— voluntary, and Social Progress, 182
Osborne judgment, the, 159

PAIN as nature's warning, 282
Parasites and quacks, 188
—— social, classes of, 185
Parasitism illustrated from plant life, 190
—— social, 183
Parliament Bill, J. A. R. Marriott on the, 354
—— Sir Edward Coke on the power of, 356
Patriotism, a Socialist factory foreman on, 166
—— Bakunin on, 102
—— Belfort Bax on, 165
—— Keir Hardie's, 165
Peel, Sir Robert, and the Ten Hours' Bill, 367
Personality, right of man to his, 288
Peru, State Socialism in ancient, 332
Pinkerton, A., and the Molly Maguires, 381
Plimsoll, H., and the Merchant Shipping Bill, 369
Political crisis, the, 344
Poverty, Marx's fallacious assertion of increasing, 72
Production and distribution process, 50
Profit, a payment for business ability, 65
Proletarian, Socialist definition of, 70
Proprietorship, small, 200
—— small, advantages of diffusion of, 221
Proudhon, influence of, on Marx, 256

QUELCH, H., on Christianity, 149

RADICAL party, the, 376
Rationalist challenges, 322
—— Little Bethel, 321
Reason and Superstition, 301
Reform Act of 1867, 368
Religious Communism, 334
Renan, E., on Christianity, 175
Rent, nature of, 53
Rents, rise of, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, 227
Revolution, de Tocqueville on the French, 345
—— Lord Acton on the French, 346
—— the French and the political crisis, 344
Ricardo, influence of, on Marx, 257
Rich, classification of the, 184
Risk, payment for, 60
Rodbertus, influence of, on Marx, 257
Rogers, T., on early English organisation, 216
—— on robbery of the working classes, 221
—— on trade unions, 218

Index

Roosevelt, J., accused of Socialism, 170
Russell, Lord John, and the Factory Acts, 368

SADLER, M., and the Ten Hours' Bill, 367
Salisbury, Lord, and the better housing of the working classes, 370
—— Lord, and the Workmen's Compensation Act, 370
Scarcity rates of payment, 64
Schatz, A., on Collectivist economics, 257
Schools, Anarchist, 106
—— Socialist Sunday, 105
Science and Superstition, 303
Selborne, Lord, on loafers, 183
Self-consciousness of man, 282
Shaftesbury, Lord, and the Factory Acts, 368
Social Democratic Party, 88
—— progress, 167
—— progress, three methods of, 169
Socialisation formula, 84
Socialism a perversion of a lofty ideal, 336
—— E. Ferri on the meaning of, 290
—— scientific, 49
—— silly, 115
—— State, helplessness of, 99
—— State, H. G. Wells on, 95
—— State, H. M. Hyndman on, 95
—— State, in ancient Peru, 332
—— State, R. Blatchford on, 98
Socialism, State, Sydney Webb on, 93, 99
—— State, tyranny of, 93
——State, William Morris on, 116
—— State, would make a nation of leaners, 97
—— superstitious, 49
Socialist alliance with Anarchists, 103
—— camp followers, 90
—— definition of a, 84
—— conception of the State, 285, 296
—— groups and aims, 84
—— party of Great Britain, 89
—— schemes, diversity of, 86
—— State compared with a bee-hive, 330
—— unity, 85
Socialists and pill vendors, 85, 115
—— Christian, 91
—— classification of, 89
—— early English, 256
—— Nebulous, 90, 143
—— State, 90
—— State, contempt for the people, 93
Sociality and Social Progress, 169
—— attainable through Christian teaching, 178
—— basis for, 171
—— origin of, 289
Sozial Demokrat on Christianity, 149
Spencer, Herbert, criterion of life, 278
Spinosa, B., on the nature of God, 317
State and Municipal trading, 239
—— ethical nature of the, 294

Index

State Socialism, *see* Socialism, State
—— Socialist conception of the, 285, 296
—— the, as an organism, 296, 328
—— the functions of the, 287, 294
Stephen, Sir Leslie, on Materialism, 266
Superstition and Science, 303
Surplus labour, Marxian, 43
—— labour-time, Marxian, 43
—— product of industry, 63
—— value, Marxian, 38, 43
Suthers, R. B., the wisdom of, 139
Sweating, remedies for, 193
—— wage, 30

TARIFF REFORM, 378
Taxation, land, errors of Lloyd George's, 234
—— true basis of, 236
Taxer, single, J. A. Hobson on, 235
Ten Hours' Bill, 367
Thompson, M., of *The Clarion*, 136
Thring, Lord, and Workshops Inspection Bill, 372
Thurlow, Lord, Electric Lighting Bill, 371
Tory party, the, 363, 375
Trade unions and unemployment, 228
—— unions, justification of, 218
—— Pope Leo XIII. on, 215
—— Socialism in the, and the Masters' Federation, 229
Truck Acts, 369
Tyndall, on the origin of life, 264

UNDERTAKER, business, functions of, 67
Unemployment and trade unions, 228
—— Sydney Webb on the problem of, 100
Unionist party, the, 365, 375
United States, Sir E. Grey on closer union with, 384
Universe, impossibility of an eternal uncontrolled, 262
—— rationalisation of the, 280
Use-values, 1

VALUE, Marxian surplus, 38, 43
Vedic thinkers and the eternal reason, 276
Vorhyzek on Anarchist principles, 102
Vorwärts, cunning diplomacy of, 148

WAGES, Lassalle's *Iron Law of*, 29
—— nature of, 53
—— steady increase of, 32
—— subsistence, J. A. Hobson on, 30
—— subsistence, moral element in, 55
—— sweating, 30
—— under State Socialism no longer a first charge on industry, 98
Webb, Sydney, on the helplessness of State Socialism, 99
—— on the tyranny of State Socialism, 93
Wellington, the Duke of, and the Truck Acts, 369
Wells, H. G., on the tyranny of State Socialism, 95

Index

Westcott, Bishop, so-called Socialism of, 78, 289
Wharnecliffe, Lord, and the Truck Acts, 370
Whig party, the, 364, 375
Working classes, the, and Pope Leo XIII., 201
Workmen's Compensation Act of 1884, 370
World, rational view of the, 276
Wyndham, George, and the Irish Land Purchase Act, 382

THE END

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co.
Edinburgh & London

In handsome Cloth. Pages i–xxxi + 654. *Illustrated.* **15s.** *net.*

A Treatise on
Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe

By G. W. DE TUNZELMANN, B.Sc., ETC.

"Full of matter of the greatest interest."—The Right Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.

"I have begun to read it solidly through, and find great benefit. You put things very clearly."—Sir WILLIAM RAMSAY, O.M., F.R.S.

"I think that, if your mathematics are correct, you have made an important contribution to the general argument."—Professor W. R. SORLEY, D.Litt.

"I have been reading lately with great pleasure and advantage your book on Electrical Theory, and am impressed with the strong grasp you possess over the subject in all its details, and the manner in which you have elucidated some of the most intricate points in modern electrical theory."—Professor J. A. FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S.

"Although much wider in scope and more deep seated in its foundations, this exposition of Electrical Theory may be compared to Lloyd's treatise on the Wave Theory of Light, which in its day did more to spread a general knowledge of the labours of Young and Fresnel than any other book. So here, Mr. Tunzelmann has taken a wide grasp of all the essential features of this modern theory . . . the general discussion is wonderfully clear."—*Philosophical Magazine.*

"Le livre de Mr. Tunzelmann peut être compris par tout esprit cultivé ; c'est un ouvrage de haute vulgarisation comme les savants anglais savent les écrire. Il est destiné principalement aux étudiants, mais nous sommes convaincu que professeurs et ingénieurs y trouveront aussi à s'instruire."—*La Revue Électrique.*

"Das lesenswerte, überaus reichhaltige, in der Darstellung klare und anschauliche, . . . typisch englische Werk bezweckt in erster linie, dem Studierenden der Physik einen Ueberblick über

die moderne Elektiricitätstheorie und ihre verwertung für die Theorie der Materie im allgemeinen zu geben."—*Physikalische Zeitschrift.*

"The chapter on 'The Place of Mind in the Universe' is a fascinating one."—*Nature.*

"Personally we may say—after a wide experience of physical text-books—that we know no book which gives such an accurate and comprehensive presentation of that wide branch of physics which deals with electro-magnetism . . . an excellent book, which we can cordially recommend to the educated layman and philosopher as well as to the student of science . . . a mine of valuable information."—*The Month.*

"This remarkable volume . . . it is impossible to follow the reasoning of Mr. de Tunzelmann without realising that it is physics of the kind here summarised that will constitute the foundation of all future advance in engineering . . . one of the most valuable contributions to electrical literature that the year has produced."—*The Times.*

"A brilliant treatise . . . one that can be read by a layman. . . . The last chapter is an important contribution to the true relationship of physics and metaphysics."—*Contemporary Review.*

"'Goes for' Haeckel hammer and tongs with delightful vigour. Haeckel's Riddle of the Universe is torn to tatters."—*Electrical Times.*

"A work of very great importance. Mr. de Tunzelmann has completely surmounted the extreme difficulties of the task he set himself. . . . The whole book is of most absorbing interest. . . . It is really extraordinary how the author has succeeded in presenting to the reader in clear and logical terms theories which are usually completely obscured, at any rate to the many, in the guise of abstruse mathematical formulæ."—*Railway Official Gazette.*

London: CHARLES GRIFFIN & Co., Ltd.

Will be published shortly by Messrs. JAMES CLARKE & Co., London

MODERN PHYSICS AND RATIONAL ETHICS, or, THE UNIVERSE ACCORDING TO MODERN SCIENCE, AND THE BASIS IT AFFORDS FOR THEISM, JUSTICE, AND PERSONAL FREEDOM.

This is a course of lectures first delivered in Manchester; now in course of delivery at Sion College, London; and to be repeated at the University of London, University College (by kind consent of the University College Committee), beginning May 4.

THE CASE AGAINST SOCIALISM

WITH PREFATORY LETTER BY THE

RIGHT HON. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.

546 pages, Crown 8vo, cloth, **2s. 6d.** net

[SECOND EDITION

***SPECTATOR.*—"This useful compilation should prove of no little value, not only to speakers and writers, but to all who wish to acquaint themselves with the great controversy of the hour."**

SOCIALISM IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

By W. G. TOWLER

(*Secretary London Municipal Society*)

352 pages, Crown 8vo, cloth, **2s. 6d.** net

[SECOND EDITION

***DAILY TELEGRAPH.*—"One of the clearest and most convincing expositions which have appeared on the dangerous unchecked Socialism."**

PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY

WEALTH, LABOUR, SOCIALISM, &c.

By ANDREW CARNEGIE

Crown 8vo, cloth, **2s.** net; Paper covers, **1s.** net

[SECOND EDITION

***STANDARD.*—"Master and man alike will find much of real interest in this book."**

GOOD CITIZENSHIP

ESSAYS ON SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Edited by J. E. HAND

With Preface by the BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM

Crown 8vo, cloth, 528 pages, **3s. 6d.** net

SCIENCE IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Edited by J. E. HAND

With Preface by the Right Hon. R. B. HALDANE

Crown 8vo, cloth, 320 pages, **3s. 6d.** net

GEORGE ALLEN & COMPANY, LTD., LONDON

THE SHAKESPEARE REVIVAL

A BOOK ON THE STRATFORD MOVEMENT

By REGINALD R. BUCKLEY, MARY NEAL, and ARTHUR HUTCHINSON

With Introduction by F. R. BENSON, and 16 Full-page Illustrations of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre and Portraits of the leading Actors of the day

Crown 8vo, cloth, **3s. 6d.** net

IDEALS OF SCIENCE AND FAITH

In 10 Essays. Edited by J. E. HAND

Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, **3s. 6d.** net

[SECOND EDITION

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The aim of this NEW SERIES is to give an absolutely trustworthy, authentic, and up-to-date description of British Interests, Resources, and Life throughout the Empire.

YESTERDAY and TO-DAY in CANADA

By the DUKE OF ARGYLL

With Map, Large Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, **6s.** net

With New Appendix giving the Author's views of the RECIPROCITY TREATY.

[SECOND EDITION

SATURDAY REVIEW.—"Packed with information and data."

MODERN INDIA

By SIR J. D. REES, K.C.I.E., C.V.O.

With Map, Large Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, **6s.** net

ST. JAMES'S GAZETTE.—"An instructive survey of India and its problems. A subject on which the author writes with authority."

RUSKIN'S WORKS

POCKET EDITION . . Cloth, 1s. 6d.; Leather, 2s. 6d.
POPULAR EDITION . Cloth, 1s.; Leather, 1s. 6d.

THE CROWN OF WILD OLIVE. On Work, Traffic, War, and the Future of England. With additional matter. *104th Thousand.*

TIME AND TIDE. On Laws of Work. *58th Thousand.*

UNTO THIS LAST. On the First Principles of Political Economy. *111th Thousand.*

MUNERA PULVERIS. On the Elements of Political Economy. *19th Thousand.*

GEORGE ALLEN & COMPANY, LTD., LONDON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
AT
LOS ANGELES
LIBRARY

HX

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

AA 000 388 704 9